United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 104th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 141 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 13, 1995 No. 198—Part II

House of Representatives

DISPOSING OF SENATE AMENDMENT 115 TO H.R. 1868, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

(Continued)

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 296, I call up from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 1868) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment numbered 115 thereto, and to consider the motion printed in section 2 of the resolution.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KINGSTON). The Clerk will designate the Senate amendment.

The text of the Senate amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment 115:

Page 44, line 19, after ''lizations'' insert: ''*:Provided,* That in determining eligibility for assistance from funds appropriated to carry out section 104 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, nongovernmental and multilateral organizations shall not be subjected to requirements more restrictive than the requirements applicable to foreign governments for such assistance: *Provided further,* That none of the funds made available under this Act may be used to lobby for or against abortion''.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. CALLAHAN

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. CALLAHAN moves that the House recede from its amendment to the amendment of the Senate numbered 115, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert:

''Authorization of Population Planning

''Sec. 518A. Section 526 of this Act shall not apply to funds made available in this Act for population planning activities or other population assistance pursuant to section 104(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act or any other provision of law, or to funds made available in title IV of this Act as a contribution to the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA).''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 296, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and a Member opposed, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON], will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN].

☐ 1115

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the disposition of Senate amendment number 115, and that I be permitted to include tabular and extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOODLATTE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Mr. Speaker. I do not want to take any more time on this matter than what is necessary. We have already had this matter, population assistance and abortion, before the House four times previously this year. I want to be sure, however, that all Members understand what the motion does and does not do.

The motion provided for by the rule does not cut population funding. It freezes obligations under the fiscal 1996 bill for population funding until it has been authorized or a further waiver of the statutory authorization requirement has been enacted. It does not halt the hundreds of millions of dollars of population funding from prior year bills that has not yet been spent.

This motion does not ask the Senate to agree to enact a funding cutoff for foreign private groups that decline to comply with the Mexico City policy restrictions. The Senate does not have the votes to do that.

Mr. Speaker, I want the Members to be aware of another proposal that I offered to the Senate managers of the foreign assistance bill several weeks ago.

Mr. Speaker, as the Members may be aware, we have had various differences with the Senate on this proposition. As a matter of fact, the original bill that was sent to the Senate came back with 193 amendments. We were able to resolve 192 of the differences between the House and Senate. The only one that could not be resolved is the issue on abortion. We have tried, and tried with frustration, to look at a possible way to pass the foreign operations bill for 1996, to satisfy those that are concerned about abortion worldwide, that are concerned about planned parenthood, to no avail. We simply have been unable to get the votes in the Senate to make this reality come true for the 1996 foreign operations bill.

We are in a situation now that we will send another bill to the Senate and ask that they, with their great wisdom, find a way to pass something that can pass through the Senate and that also can be acceptable to the House. I, for example, have offered what I think was a reasonable compromise to the pro-life forces in the House, and that was to cut the funding capability of any organization to 50 percent of its 1995 level until they sign the Mexico City policy language. In my opinion, that is a fair resolve in this House of compromise.

If we do not get something to the Senate and get something from the Senate that we can concur on, that will satisfy us, we are not going to have a 1996 appropriation bill for foreign operations.

☐ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., ☐ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

Instead, we are going to be dealing in a continuing resolution, a CR that more than likely will not include any protection for those of us that are concerned about abortion worldwide. A CR may not protect anything that has to do with child survival. We could lose many things, including the prohibition of USAID from moving into a Taj Mahal downtown and paying each month hundreds of thousands of dollars in unnecessary rent. A CR will not reduce funding to USAID. It will not cut the funding that we were successful in passing through this House, unless we get something realistic that both sides can work with.

In a sense, Mr. Speaker, I chastise those Members of Congress who are so hell-bent and determined to have their way that they are interfering, in my opinion, with the due process and with the compromise that this body must occasionally represent.

Mr. Speaker, this measure is another vehicle going back to the Senate. We do not expect the Senate to accept it. I would not think that the President would sign the bill if they Senate passed it, so it is futile, in a sense, to think that we are going to enact this legislation with this language in here, but it is the only opportunity we have to send this train back to the Senate and ask them to look at it and to take into account those of us who are concerned about abortion being funded or encouraged by any American moneys.

I want Members to be aware of another proposal that I offered to the Senate managers of the foreign assistance bill several weeks ago. I suggested that they accept what I call an incentive program for private groups to accept the Mexico City policy language.

Under my proposal, which is not in this rule, all groups which now receive A.I.D. population money could continue to receive up to 50 percent of current funding. However, there would be no funding limits on foreign private groups which agreed to comply with Mexico City principles. That would be the incentive for many is not most population assistance providers to sign on to the Mexico City principles again, as the did prior to 1993.

I recognize that the gentleman from New Jersey opposes the approach that I just described. Yet another pro-life Members of this body and the Senate continue to express interest in it. I just wanted the House to know that many of us have been working on a compromise that will enable us to send this appropriations bill to the President for his signature.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, again we are here because the committee has still not finished its work. We are here because there are still six appropriation bills which have not yet crossed the finish line and become law. The foreign operations bill which we are discussing today is one of those bills. We are going to be in a big fight over whether or not we should pass the CR come Friday, a continuing resolution to prevent the Government from closing down. And we are going to be in that fight because we have not yet finished our appropriations work. I would think that under those circumstances what we would be looking for is ways to find compromise between the House and Senate so we can move more of these bills forward.

That is what I very much want to do on this bill, but this language, as the gentleman who just spoke clearly indicated, this language has no chance whatsoever of being accepted by the Senate or becoming law. So my question is, why on earth should we do this?

Mr. Speaker, this proposal meets somebody's strategic idea that what we have to do is send another piece of legislation to the Senate which we know will not pass. I think all that does is to harden each side, rather than make each side more flexible. I would point out, the practical effect of this strategy is to ask 221 Members of this House from both sides of the aisle who voted against this proposition on the Labor-HEW bill to vote for it today.

What this proposition essentially does is to eliminate all international family planning money. This is not an abortion issue. I support efforts, for instance, to shut off funding for the U.N. population program if it continues to operate in China. I agree with the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] on that issue. However, I do not agree with, and I do not think most Members of this House do, and I know that many Members on the Republican side of the aisle do not agree with the idea of eliminating all authority for any family planning programs internationally.

The following Members voted against this amendment when it was offered by the gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. LIVINGSTON, from the HEW bill. I am going to read everybody's name:

Messrs. ABERCROMBIE, ACKERMAN, BAESLER, BALDACCI, BARRETT of Wisconsin, BASS, BECERRA, BEILENSON, BENTSEN, BEREUTER, BERMAN, BILBRAY, BISHOP, BLUTE, BOEHLERT, BONIOR, BORSKI, BOUCHER, BROWDER, and BROWN T1OF CALIFORNIA, MS. BROWN of Florida, Messrs. BROWN of Ohio, BRYANT of Texas, CARDIN, CASTLE, CHAPMAN, and CLAY, Ms. CLAYTON, Messrs. CLEMENT, CLINGER, CLYBURN, and COLEMAN, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Miss COLLINS of Michigan, Messrs. CONDIT, CONYERS, COYNE, and CRAMER, Ms. DANNER, Mr. DAVIS, and Mr. DE LA GARZA.

I am reading now the names of all Members of the House who voted against this proposition last time: Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DELAURO, Messrs. DELLUMS, DEUTSCH, DICKS, DINGELL, DIXON, DOGGETT, DOOLEY, and DOYLE, Ms. DUNN of Washington, Messrs. DURBIN, EDWARDS, EHRLICH, and ENGLE, Ms. ESHOO, Messrs. EVANS, FARR, FATTAH, FAWELL, FAZIO of California, FIELDS of Louisiana, FILNER, FLAKE, FOGLIETTA, FOLEY, and FORD, Mrs. FOWLER, Messrs. FRANK of Massachusetts, FRANKS of Connecticut, FRANKS of New Jersey, FRELINGHUYSEN, and FROST.

Continuing reading the names of all Members who voted against this last time:

Ms. FURSE, Messrs. GANSKE, GEJDENSON, GEKAS, GEPHARDT, PETE GEREN of Texas, GIBBONS, GILCHREST, GILMAN, GONZALEZ, GORDON, GENE GREEN of Texas, GREENWOOD, GUNDERSON, GUTIERREZ, and HAMILTON, Ms. HARMAN, Messrs. HASTINGS of Florida, HEFNER, HILLIARD, HINCHEY, HOBSON, HORN, HOUGHTON, and HOYER, Ms. JACKSON-LEE, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, and Mr. KANJORKSI, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mrs. KENNELLY, Messrs. KLECZKA, KLINK, KLUG, KOLBE, LANTOS, LAZIO of New York, LEACH, LEVIN, LEWIS of California, and LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. LINCOLN, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LONGLEY, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. LUTHER, Mrs. MALONEY, Messrs. MARKEY, MARTINEZ, MARTINI, and MATSUI, Ms. MCCARTHY, Messrs. MCDERMOTT, MCHALE, and MCINNIS, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. MEEHAN, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Messrs. MFUME, MILLER of California, MINETA, and MINGE, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. MORAN, and Mrs. MORELLA.

Continuing to read the names of all Members who voted against this proposition the last time:

Messrs. NADLER, NEAL, OBEY, OLVER, OWENS, PALLONE, PASTOR, PAYNE of New Jersey, and PAYNE of Virginia, Ms. PELOSI, Messrs. PETERSON of Florida, PICKETT, POMEROY, and PORTER, Ms. PRYCE, Messrs. RAMSTAD, RANGEL, REED, REGULA, RICHARDSON, and RIGGS, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. ROSE, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Messrs. RUSH, SABO, SANDERS, SAWYER, and SCHIFF, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Messrs. SCHUMER, SCOTT, SERRANO, SHAW, SHAYS, SISISKY, and SKAGGS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Messrs. SPRATT, STARK, STOKES, STUDDS, TANNER, THOMAS, THOMPSON, THORNTON, TORKILDSEN, TORRES, TORRICELLI, TOWNS, TRAFICANT, and UPTON, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ Messrs. VENTO, VISCLOSKY, and WARD, Ms. WATERS, Messrs. WATT of North Carolina, WAXMAN, WHITE, WILLIAMS, WILSON, and WISE, Ms. WOOLSEY, Messrs. WYDEN, WYNN, YATES, ZELIFF, and ZIMMER.

All of those Members voted against this proposition when the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] offered language which in essence cut off funding for all family planning domestically.

Mr. Speaker, I would submit that cutting off all family planning funds for international programs is even worse, because if you do, you know that that will disarm us in our ability to try to do something about uncontrolled population growth in many sectors of the world. If you are for compromise, you ought to be looking for

compromise language. You should not swallow language which the manager of the bill himself indicates has no chance whatsoever of becoming law. All that is going to do is guarantee that we have to have a continuing resolution for this bill. I do not think we ought to be doing that. We ought to be trying to find ways to pass this bill.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I might say that this does not deny funding to Planned Parenthood or to any of the agencies. It just simply says what we have heard over and over again in this House: that the Committee on Appropriations ought not to be authorizing items, so we have appropriated the money in this bill. We just simply say that until such time as the Congress of the United States authorizes it through an authorization bill, that the money cannot be spent.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], the chairman of our committee.

(Mr. LIVINGSTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

□ 1130

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I was glad to see the chart from the gentleman from Wisconsin once again. In fact, that chart is looking better every day. All those black lines mean that the appropriations bills are working their way through the process.

It may take a little bit longer than we might have hoped, but they are betting there and that chart is going to be complete someday, hopefully within the next week. We will find out at Christmastime, either this Christmas or next Christmas, as to whether or not the chart is complete.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. I would be happy to buy the gentleman the biggest scotch in town if all of those bills are passed by Christmas.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. We will see.

Actually the fact is the administration is negotiating, or course, with the Congress to see whether or not we can come to a package deal and complete business on all of these appropriations bills. I want to ask the gentleman's indulgence and allow me to draw the lines to complete the chart when the package is complete.

The point is, though, that we have indeed passed seven entire appropriations subcommittee bills and they have been signed into law. The eighth, the Commerce-Justice-State bill, goes to the President today for his signature or his veto. The VA–HUD bill, the Foreign Ops bill which is on the floor today and the Interior bill are all working their way through various processes and should be complete by, if not the end of this week, certainly by the end of next week, we hope.

the District of Columbia bill, likewise, has one or two issues in conference that remain to be dealt with. I think that that bill will be on the floor very shortly.

So the only bill that really is far from passage, and that is because the other party as filibustering it in the Senate, is the Labor-HHS bill.

We are working our way through these bills. This bill unfortunately has been to the floor twice before. This is the third time. This is a conference report that has been hung up on the issue of abortion. We have come to an impasse. The Senate does not want to adopt the language that the House has offered. So we have offered some new language which we hope they will consider and which we hope that they will adopt. They may or may not. But we have to move the process forward.

In the spirit of doing exactly that, I would ask all of our Members to join with us, pass this bill one more time, get it to the Senate and let them work their will and hopefully let us get this bill to the President for his signature.

There has been some disagreement on exactly what the language was that disallowed funding for family planning, international family planning. I would say in response to what the gentleman from Wisconsin said that that amendment really had little to do with this provision. This deals with UNFPA, U.N. family planning operations, and all it does is freeze the money in place. It says the money is there but that the money will be frozen until such time as the authorization bill is passed.

Frankly, it would be better if the issue of abortion were handled in the authorization bills. Because it is policy that should be handled by the authorization bills. And so what this does is to remove the issue of abortion and transfer it to the place it belongs, to the authorization committees for them to consider, for them to assess the policy ramifications and for them to ultimately pass the law.

This is an attempt to take abortion out of the appropriations process and say to the authorizers, you do the job, and let us not hang up the appropriations bills in this House and in the Senate up any longer so that we can get the country's business done and so that we can get the functions of government funded and so that we do not have to waste any more time and be here at Christmastime.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WILSON. I was just going to ask the chairman if he understands and remembers that it has been 10 years since we had an authorization bill on foreign aid.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Reclaiming my time, the gentleman has reminded me that it has been a very long time, but I am very hopeful and optimistic that we are going to pass one this year or certainly within the next 3 months. Certainly before the gentleman retires.

Mr. WILSON. I hope so.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. And we do not want him to retire, we hope he decides to stay around, but if that is his decision, I hope that by the time he retires, he will have confidence and knowledge that the Foreign Affairs authorization bill has been passed by both Houses and enacted into law so he can take that with him back to Texas.

Mr. WILSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to vote for this bill.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY].

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment because it will effectively eliminate funding for international family planning. Our colleagues on the far right continue to hold up this bill with their extreme legislative agenda. This has got to stop. Let us pass this bill.

After all, this amendment is just another way to masquerade the issue and stop all family planning funding. Let us stop it and let us get this bill passed today.

Our chairman, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN], has crafted an excellent foreign aid bill. This extreme language, I say to the chairman, is preventing this critical bill from being enacted.

Let me tell my colleagues exactly what is happening here. Our anti-choice colleagues have attempted to place restrictions on the international family planning programs in this bill, despite the fact that abortion funding overseas has been prohibited since 1973. Their restrictions have been rejected by the Senate three times. We have heard the message loud and clear.

Now their solution to the Senate's refusal to accept their extreme restrictions is to do something even more extreme, to eliminate the programs altogether.

This bill is already 2½ months late, and rather than offer a true compromise or simply accept that their restrictions have failed 3 times, our colleagues on the right now offer an amendment that they know both the Senate and the administration will reject.

Why do they insist on wasting our time with this? This is the fourth time that we have voted on this appropriations bill. Why do they continue to play politics with a bill that contains funding for so many vital programs throughout the world?

Their amendment will effectively end one of the most important forms of aid that we provide to other countries, family planning assistance. The amendment exempts the family planning program, and only the family planning program, from the waiver in the bill that allows funds to be appropriated even though the foreign aid authorization bill has not passed.

What our colleagues have not told you is that the foreign aid authorization bill has not passed in a dozen

years, and I know the chairman is optimistic. The Senate has already indicated that it will not pass the authorization bill this year.

The reality is, it could be years before an authorization bill is signed into law. We know that. In the meantime, we will have failed to fund vital family planning programs throughout the world.

No one can deny that the need for family planning services in developing countries is urgent. The aid we provide is valuable and worthwhile.

The world's population is growing at an unprecedented rate. In 40 years our planet's population will more than double. As a responsible world leader, the United States must do more to deter the environmental, political and health consequences of this explosive growth.

Let us not forget what family planning assistance means to women around the world. Complications of pregnancy, childbirth, unsafe abortion are the leading killers of women of reproductive age. One million women die each year as a result of reproductive health problems. Each year 250,000 women die from unsafe abortions. Only 20 to 35 percent of women in Africa and Asia receive prenatal care. Five hundred million married women want contraceptives but cannot obtain them. Most of these disabilities and deaths could be prevented.

This amendment will stop us from continuing our fight against these tragedies. Simply put, this amendment will end our family planning programs. Period. that is what it would do.

I urge my colleagues, once again, oppose this amendment. We cannot let them eliminate international family planning. There is too much at stake. Let us pass this excellent appropriations bill. Let us take off this extreme amendment. Let us not vote on this again. We need this bill.

I again salute the chairman on this outstanding bill. Let us pass it here today. Let us not bow to the right that continues to tack on the extreme amendments. Let us not do it. Let us join and pass this bill today.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Responding to the kind gentlewoman from New York, let me thank her for her help during this past year or so, too, and to tell her that I am optimistic that the Senate is going to bring up the authorization bill either today or tomorrow under a unanimous-consent agreement.

I think for the first time in the 10 years that they have not been able to pass a bill, they are finally going to have a bill that passes the House and the Senate and goes to conference. This is the argument that we always hear, those of us who are appropriators: Do not authorize, do not authorize, you are appropriators.

In this bill, we appropriate the money. What we simply say is it cannot be spent until it is authorized by the proper committee.

Mrs. LOWEY. If the gentleman will yield, let me just say that I am happy the holidays are coming and we all have wishes. I do wish the authorization bill would pass as well as you do but it has not passed in 12 years and I would rather deal with fact rather than fiction, although I wish you and the authorization bill well.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KNOLLENBERG], a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time and appreciate his leadership on this issue.

Incidentally, and this is not so incidentally, I rise in strong support for this conference report and for its passage. But I do want to refer to, first of all, the chart that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] brought out. I do like the looks of that chart. It is getting better.

It is because we are working a lot harder to get to a point of success. None of this is very easy. The chairman referred to the fact that we had 193 amendments in the conference committee. We completed and agreed upon 192. The one remaining, of course, is the one we are dealing with today.

This language, I think, ensures that any expenditure of funds for population planning or the UNFPA must be, as has been pointed out here, specifically authorized by this body, which has not been done.

Somebody on the other side made the comment about it has not been done in 10 years. Well, that is not to say it should not be done. I think it should be. We have an opportunity perhaps where that will take place.

We have to be able to debate these things or we will not get anywhere. So maybe this is, in the eyes of the gentlewoman from New York, an extraneous matter, should be done away with, forgotten about, so we can pass this beautiful bill. Well, it is important to a lot of us. It is worth debate. It is something that we want to carry on and come to some conclusion, a successful conclusion.

I would not suggest to you that it is guaranteed, as the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] stated, that the Senate will just let this thing float and die. We do not know that yet entirely. There is some idea here that may be beginning to impress them, that there is perhaps more to this and we can come to a conclusion that will satisfy everybody.

As I have said many times before, I strongly support this conference report. It balances fiscal restraint and the needs of foreign policy, and it reflects the reasoned compromise and considerable cooperation that did take place between all of the Members from both sides in committee and also in the conference committee. It deserves bipartisan support.

I think we are at a point now where we can get to a position of passing a bill that is in dire need of being passed. I agree with the sense of urgency but I do not agree that this is an unimportant matter. It is very important to may of us, and it does allow for the continuation of funding at the appropriate time for the specific family planning ideas. It just has to be authorized.

H.R. 1868 allows us to continue to remain active in world events while it reflects our budgetary constraints, and you all know that. This conference report reflects, I believe, what is best for this body. We will send it to the Senate. They will make their decision. I support this conference report and urge all of my colleagues to vote for it.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I just want to reassure the gentleman from Michigan that I respect your views on the issues of abortion, just as I respect the views of every one of my colleagues. I just think it is so unfortunate that every appropriations bill is tied up in abortion. I do wish we could isolate that issue, have a real debate, and move this appropriations bill now.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon [Ms. FURSE].

Ms. FURSE. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I think we should be very clear. This amendment is simply a way to freeze the family planning funds. This amendment targets only family planning, that portion of the legislation.

Family planning works. No one wants abortion to be the only way to control pregnancy. Family planning gets us beyond abortion. It allows people to control the size of their families and thereby control their economies. Family planning is absolutely profamily.

□ 1145

It is truly the most pro-family thing we can do, because it allows families to make the decisions. It is so ridiculous. You know, if I asked my constituents, many, many of them say to me, ''You know the greatest problem in this world is over population,'' over population because of use of resources, because of the stress it puts on communities, overpopulation is a great threat.

Family planning allows us to move beyond. Family planning is one of the greatest parts of getting us to peace and prosperity internationally, because it allows families to decide on how many children they are having. So we really need to defeat this anti-family amendment.

I urge my colleagues to do that.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH], a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. Mr.

Speaker, the House has voted four times to support the pro-life provisions which would ensure that international family planning assistance will be abortion neutral. The first provision prohibits tax dollars from being used by the United Nations Population Fund—which currently helps manage China's brutal one-child-per-one-family policy unless it ceases family planning activities in the People's Republic of China or unless China's family planning activities in China cease to be coercive.

The second provision would ensure that none of the moneys sent to the UNPF may be used to fund any private, nongovernmental, or multilateral organizations that directly or through a subcontractor perform abortions in any foreign country—except to save the life of the mother or in cases of rape or incest.

Now some may claim that this is a gag rule on family planning assistance. However, this is not the case. Abortion is not considered a family planning method and should not be promoted as one, especially by the United States. Recently, the State Department decided that the promotion of abortion should be a priority in advancing U.S. population-control efforts. This is unacceptable to the millions of Americans who do not view abortion as a legitimate method of family planning and do not support Federal funding of abortion except to save the life of the mother or in cases of rape or incest.

The Callahan motion does not eliminate or even reduce the appropriations for population assistance but will leave the appropriations levels in H.R. 1868 intact. However it will delay the use of these appropriated funds until these expenditures are authorized. It will also delink pro-life issues from other important provisions such as aid to Israel, child survival programs and other foreign aid programs.

I urge my colleagues Mr. Speaker to support this motion and allow this important legislation to move forward and fund vital foreign aid programs.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN].

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, in the 19th century at the height of the Industrial Revolution, there arose a political group which frankly was opposed to the change and progress of the Industrial Revolution. They were known as the Luddites. The Luddites would try to wreck the machinery of the Industrial Revolution to stop the change that was taking place. They objected to it, and they used violence and terrorism for that purpose. Theirs was a mindless opposition to the reality of change, a resistance to accepting the world as it existed.

What we hear on the floor today is the same mentality when it comes to family planning, a mindless opposition to family planning from groups which characterize themselves as pro-life. Anyone who has taken the time to study the issue understands that the greatest world threats to our children are nuclear proliferation and overpopulation.

Take a look at the expanding population in continents around the world, whether in Asia, Africa, South America. You will find that those expanding populations not only create human suffering for the people living there, but they, in fact, lead to environmental disasters which visit themselves on the entire world as well as to military confrontations which ultimately drag the United States and other civilized nations into the vortex of the conflict. Overpopulation is a major problem.

What we are doing with this motion today is literally shutting down America's commitment to family planning around the world. We are not talking about abortion. I hold in my hand a penny, one penny; not one penny is being spent of Federal money to fund abortions in any country of the world. You would never know that from this debate. You would think we were setting out to fund abortions and the pro-life people wanted to stop it. It has nothing to do with it. Not a penny of Federal funds are being used for that purpose. What we are doing, in closing down this $450 million of family planning is adding to degradation and personal disaster around the world and, sadly, adding to the likelihood that move abortion will result.

Several years ago I traveled with Congressman Mike Synar to Bangladesh, one of the poorest countries in the world. Far away in a distant, dusty village we met a 19-year-old woman holding a baby. It was her third child. Through an interpreter she told us with great pride it would be her last child. Because of world health efforts which the United States supported, her children were healthy, and she did not have to bear any more children and through family planning efforts, that we spend pennies on, she was able to control the size of her family.

She and so many other women around the world, given a chance for their own personal dignity, will be denied that chance because of this terrible motion. I urge my colleagues, do not give in to this extremism. Oppose this motion.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Callahan motion, which represents yet another sincere attempt by Chairman CALLAHAN to seek a compromise approach to this issue on which so many of us feel so very strongly.

As most of my colleagues know, I have been a very strong supporter of the pro-life Mexico City policy which is designed to protect innocent unborn children around the world by barring United States family planning funds to foreign organizations that perform or promote abortion overseas. The House has voted four times, four times, in favor of that legislation this year. It should be clear by now, Mr. Speaker, that one way or the other pro-lifers will not stand by. We will not allow the abortion industry to get an infusion of literally hundreds of millions of dollars in foreign aid for the promotion of the killing of unborn children in other lands or by lobbying to bring down their statutes.

More than 95, closer to 100, countries of the world have pro-life statutes, and these nongovernmental organizations, some, not all, get into these countries, begin networking, and they have been working aggressively to bring down those pro-life statutes.

I do not think the U.S. taxpayer should be making these organizations the dominant force in these capitals around the world. Family planning, yes; abortion promotion, and abortion performance except in the cases of rape, incest, and life of the mother, which is what the original language had in it, they are the exception; but family planning, yes; abortion, no.

I would also remind Members that I have been a very strong supporter of linking UNFPA funding, U.N. Population Fund, to withdrawal of UNFPA from the program in China where forced abortion is commonplace and prevalent and where the UNFPA has been the dominant cheerleader for the population program in Beijing, in the People's Republica of China. Again, if the Senate or the White House will not budge on this at this time, pro-lifers are not going to cave.

We will allow the money, we will push the money for family planning, but will not allow it to be used in any way, shape, or form for the promotion of abortion or for promoting this coercion in the People's Republican of China. The pro-life Members are willing to support this motion which deletes these two provision, but says we have got the wait until the authorizers take it up and then the bill will pass, I believe, and will be signed. Otherwise, we go back. We put the language back into the appropriations bill. That is fine with me.

If the Senate will not budge, we stay here until hell freezer over, because unborn children are precious and the women in the People's Republic of China, who have been victimized by the brutality of that program are precious as well.

I absolutely and categorically reject those who stand on the floor and say we are stopping all family planning funding. During the many years that the Mexico City program was in effect, 350 plus nongovernmental organizations, more NGO's than we had the money to fund, accepted the Mexico City clauses of no abortion promotion and got their money for family planning in Bangladesh, in Africa, in Central America. Planned Parenthood, Western Hemisphere, got, if I remember correctly, about $10 million when they agreed they would no longer be promoting abortion. The got their

money to stay on point, and that is family planning, not abortion.

We are insisting on very modest language that says we are not going to be in the business of promoting abortion or performing it except in those very rare cases. We are not going to allow these organizations to be lobbying to bring down these anti-abortion statutes around the globe.

The family planning money will then flow. Nobody will object to it, and condoms and some of the other things that are disseminated will go out without any impediment, but we will not be in the business of empowering the abortion industry.

Vote for the Callahan motion.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY].

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

This amendment is a gross misuse of the political process to thwart the will of the American people who overwhelmingly support family planning in this country and around the world.

Once again, the new majority is attempting to put the radical right's agenda ahead of good government and global responsibility. It is clear that their actions show little concern for women's health, pre and postnatal care, health and nutrition for children, families, and stabilizing global population, and the problems that flow from it, including the massive increases recently in refugees.

The Callahan measure would make it illegal to appropriate funds for international family planning programs unless they are authorized. We need to vote to save international family planning programs. We need to vote to protect families, children, and women around the world. We need to defeat this politically motivated action by anti-family, anti-women Members here. It goes against everything this country agreed upon, and I might add, 187 other countries agreed upon at the International Conference for Women in Beijing.

Supporting international family planning programs is socially responsible, fiscally sound, and it serves our national purposes.

Vote to support women and families around the world. Defeat the Callahan motion.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, so eloquent is the gentleman from Illinois and so knowledgeable of this subject is the gentleman from Illinois, it would be immoral to deny him any restriction on time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE], but remind him that we are down to about 5 minutes.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I suggest the gentleman correct the RECORD when it comes around for his extravagance in introducing me.

You know, when you get in this debate, you have to expect to be called names, and I have been called some wonderful names, some colorful names. Today it was mindless Luddite, and, you know, you can play that game. I would call people who think abortion is a good idea or an acceptable idea, or something the American taxpayer ought to pay for, I would not call them mindless, but I might call them heartless. I might call them unthinking. But I do not want to get into that game.

I want to just try to talk a little reality here. Family planning is not abortion, and abortion is not family planning, and when you link the two together you have got real problems, because many of us do not want to have American tax dollars go to pay for killing unborn children even if they are in Bangladesh or if they are in Toledo. We think human life ought to be special and ought to be sacred, and killing it, exterminating it, however you do it, is wrong and ought not to be paid for with tax dollars. That is what the struggle is about, and we are entitled to access to the political process to try and make our point.

But when misstatements are made, we have to wonder who is being mindless. For example, family planning flourishes under our program. Forty percent of all the dollars that are spent worldwide on family planning come from the United States and did under Reagan and Bush.

□ 1200

It is simply two organizations that will not accept the money because they want to continue promoting abortion. So there are 300-some organizations that are happy to take our family planning money. Meanwhile around the world family planning, properly understood, which is either helping someone to get pregnant or keeping them from getting pregnant; it is not exterminating the pregnancy once it has occurred, and that is what my colleagues are talking about, and we are asking those gentlemen from Mount Olympus across the rotunda to please understand we are for family planning, we are for foreign aid. It is abortion we are not for. We think that is despicable, we think it is wrong, and we do not think tax dollars ought to go pay for it.

So overpopulation; we have heard two speakers bemoan that as one of the great problems in the world. I suggest that is an unsophisticated look at a serious problem. Density is what we should look at, how many people per square mile. There are countries on the globe with a higher density than many of these countries that have overpopulation problems and yet a high standard of living. Japan, Switzerland, Holland have high density, high standard of living. Maybe it is something more than the number of people, maybe it is the economy, maybe it is the kind of government, maybe it is society. But that is a rather superficial look at the problem of overpopulation.

The money is fungible. If we give the money to the International Planned Parenthood of London, and they say, ''We're going to spend our money on abortion and not your money,'' that is a bookkeeping transaction and does not fool anybody.

So I suggest that we stand fast, we continue to tell the gentleman and gentleladies across the rotunda we do not want to fund abortion.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, please let the RECORD reflect that this gentleman has not called the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] any names.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER].

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to express my respect for my chairman, for the gentleman from New Jersey, and of course for my wonderful colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE].

Mr. Speaker, the language of this proposed amendment is simply not going to fly. We know, everyone knows, that the Senate will not accept this approach. Even if they did, the President would veto the bill. We are wasting our time, we are tying up the House, we are tying up this legislation. We are delaying programs that ought to be going forward, we are delaying our commitment to Camp David that we have always observed, and I think it is totally disingenuous to say, as some on the opposite side are saying that our side is delaying the bill. They are delaying the bill.

Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Illinois just said family planning is not abortion. That is exactly right. It is against current law to spend any U.S. funds for abortion, and those of us who are arguing this matter are supporters of family planning, and not supporters of abortion. To hold all family planning funding hostage to legislative language that will not be agreed to by the Senate or by the President is to hold this entire bill hostage. And, to hold up other bills over this issue is to hold those bills hostage as well.

Mr. Speaker, we do not fund abortion. We have never funded abortion. I have always supported the Hyde amendment both domestically and internationally.

This issue is not going to be resolved with this proposal. This issue is simply delaying this entire bill from going forward, and it seems to me that we should defeat this proposal and strip all language on both sides of this issue out of this bill, and let the legislation go forward and become law.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. WELDON].

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Alabama for yielding this time to me, and I applaud the subcommittee chairman for this amendment. I think it is a very reasonable approach to dealing with this problem.

There are a lot of things that go on up here in Washington, and it is, I believe, very hard for the American public to keep a watch on everything. One

of the amazing things that has gone on up here in Washington is immediately after this President was inaugurated he started funneling a lot of foreign aid dollars into programs that promote abortion on an international scale, and the American people, in this environment that we are in of huge deficits, a huge national debt, I believe clearly do not want taxpayer dollars being used for this kind of a purpose.

The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] has come up with a very reasonable approach. He is saying that we can continue to give these organizations money but that the ones that are actively out there promoting abortion, particularly the forced abortion like we have in China, which I would imagine 99 percent of Americans find reprehensible, and it is amazing that this administration would want to pump money into those kinds of organizations. It is saying that we will not do that unless the authorizing committee actually authorizes this.

Now our colleagues on the other side of the aisle who like to put money into these kinds of programs know that they can never get authorizing language for something like this, so they are going to fight this tooth and nail, but I think it is a very reasonable approach in the part of the committee, the subcommittee chairman. I applaud him for coming up with this solution to the problem.

We need to get this bill through. I support the bill. I support all my colleagues who would stand up and rise in support of this bill, and it is a good solution to the problem.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. KENNELLY].

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, this is unfortunate that this debate has gone along these lines with linkages that should not be made. We should not be discussing family planning dash abortion. This is a family planning issue. And we are talking about no international funds can be appropriated to any international societies unless an authorization bill is passed. Well, we have not had an authorization bill for a number of years, and if my colleagues want this amendment passed, it should be attached to the authorization bill.

But this is unfortunate, that we have to be doing this, because for years and years people around this world understood that the way to deal with population problems, health problems, children who are born into families where they are not wanted, is through family planning, and to do this today means we do not realize that family planning works, and eliminating this aid would hurt countless families throughout the world and increase the number of unintended pregnancies.

We do not want abortions; we want pregnancies not to happen. Countless women around this world have no access to health care screening and do not have information on how to plan a family, how to avoid an unwanted pregnancy. Denying U.S. funds for these services does not make sense. It is an arbitrary denial, dealing with something that we all, as world citizens, should be dealing with.

Mr. Speaker, right here I have a statement of the administration's policy. We are all trying to deal with legislation, we all know we should be going forward and not getting into these kinds of discussions, and the administration says:

> If the previous House-passed language on population contained in section 518 and the substitute language were dropped, the Secretary of State would recommend that the President sign the bill.

One more problem eliminated, and we could go for it. We really should not be debating the way we are today. We should just be getting on with the business of the House.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA].

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Callahan motion. This motion is worse than the original amendment—it would prohibit any funding for family planning until the foreign aid authorization bill is approved—legislation which historically has not been enacted into law. Thus, this motion effectively kills all family planning funding for the rest of this fiscal year.

One point must be reiterated in this debate—this amendment attempts to address a nonissue—foreign aid dollars do not currently pay for any abortions and never have. For 20 years, foreign aid policy and law has clearly stated that U.S. funds cannot be used to pay for abortion services or to lobby on the issue.

What this amendment does do is kill family planning programs—resulting in more abortions.

Mr. Speaker, this foreign aid bill already includes drastic cuts in funding for population assistance overseas. The Callahan motion will further endanger women's health and will deny women and couples access to family planning information. It will increase, not reduce, abortions.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this motion.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, I am not here to call anyone any names. I think this is a debate that really is for world health. Family planning is good health. It is good for the world's families. It is instructive that over the years this type of family planning has saved more lives, and it has done so because the world's women and families have been eligible for family planning education. It is good health.

Mr. Speaker, we do not need to encourage these misstatements that have been offered about the facts that family planning is promoting abortion and forced abortions in China. Mr. Speaker, I have gone on record saying that the atrocities in China should not be tolerated. None of us are accepting of that.

But with this legislation, it would be illegal to appropriate funds for international family planning programs. That is all, that is the bottom line, of what their policy does help implement world family planning.

Organizations like International Planned Parenthood offer health care screening and information on family planning. Denying funds to organizations like International Planned Parenthood is nonsensical. This language would implement an international gag rule. The people that would be suffering would be millions of women and families across this world. One million women die each year as a result of reproductive health problems.

I started out saying this is a health bill, we want to support family planning because it is good health. This debate has nothing to do with abortion and current law which, as we all know, prohibits for the last 20 years the use of U.S. funds for abortion. It is time to err on the side of families, women, and good health.

Defeat this legislation. We want to keep what the law says, good health, good family planning, and support for our world's family of women and our world's families. In this season of caring and giving, Mr. Speaker, can we do any less?

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this motion which would eliminate all funding for international family planning organizations. This motion exempts family planning programs from the waiver in the bill that permits appropriations for foreign aid programs without passage of the foreign aid authorization bill, a bill that has not been passed in 12 years.

In other words, it would be illegal to appropriate funds for international family planning programs—and only international family programs—until the passage of the stalled foreign aid authorization bill. This new tactic by my antifamily colleagues is even more drastic than the restrictions they have been attempting to impose on the bill. This new approach will effectively kill the international family planning programs at issue by denying them funding.

Organizations like International Planned Parenthood offer basic health care screening and information on family planning. Denying funds to organizations like International Planned Parenthood is nonsensical. This language would implement an international gag rule.

With the world's population growing at an unprecedented rate, one of the most important forms of aid that we provide to other countries is family planning assistance. As a world leader, the United States must work to reduce the complications of pregnancy, childbirth, and unsafe abortions, which are the leading killers of women of reproductive age throughout the Third World. One million women die each year as a result of reproductive health problems.

But this debate has nothing to do with abortion itself. Current law prohibits—and has for 20 years—the use of U.S. funds for abortion. Foreign aid policy and law clearly states that U.S. funds may not be used to pay for abortion procedures or to lobby on the issue.

Thus, the proposed motion would simply eliminate funding for legal, and essential, health and family planning services—not abortion. Legitimate and effective international health organizations would be prohibited from providing valuable and desperately needed family planning information to women around the globe. I urge my colleagues to defeat this dangerous motion.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

□ 1215

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me, and for the gentleman's leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in complete respect, as our chairman knows, for his leadership on our Foreign Operations Subcommittee. As a member of that subcommittee, I have seen him shepherd our bill through many storms. We have this one remaining obstacle.

As Members know, we have gone back and forth and back and forth on the issue of family planning in this bill. Frankly, I do not see any reason for us to have to go through this, because this controversy is based on a false premise, the premise that $1 in this bill would be spent to fund abortions. That funding is not allowed by U.S. law, and we do not need any language to further prohibit it.

Let us all say that we all agree in this Congress that we abhor, we abhor the family planning methods used in China. I mention that issue because I see my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey, rising, and I know that issue is a bone of contention in this bill, but shouldn't be in this Congress. We all agree that it is a gross violation of human rights for the women, indeed, for the families, the people of China, to have to be subjected to China's family planning methods. The practices are atrocious and I will not go into them, except to say that no funding from this bill supports the China program.

With that in mind, Mr. Speaker, that first, none of the funds would be used for abortion, and second, that none of the funds will be used to support the family planning program which we all abhor in China, the question arises: Why are we holding the poorest of the poor people in the world who depend on family planning funds that are provided in this bill hostage to the Chinese regime's policy.

Mr. Speaker, I call this, with all due respect to my colleague, the gentleman from Albama [Mr. CALLAHAN], our distinguished chairman, the make matters worse amendment. We had a situation which was a challenge to us about funding for family planning. We have been fighting that fight. Many people who support family planning but do not support every medical option available to women to terminate a pregnancy support us in oposition to this rule. I am very pleased that staunch anti-choice Members, and I do not say that as a badge of honor, oppose this amendment. The gentleman from Ohio, TONY HALL, and I have been on opposite sides of the choice issue, and he voted against the rule on this bill because of the restrictions it places on family planning. Restrictions that are not per se in the bill, but restrictions which are by way of procedure. If we do not get the funding through this bill now and if we have to wait for an authorization at the end of the session, as we are, waiting to go out for the holidays, what will happen to the family planning funds that are so desperately needed so very soon for so many people in the world?

That is why I call this the make matters worse amendment. It tries to resolve a conflict that I do not think should be there in the first place, because we all agree that China's policy is abhorrent and none of our funds should go to it. And because we all know that there is no funding for abortion allowed under United States law. So why can we not come to a sensible conclusion which enables as to fund family planning?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. PELOSI. I am pleased to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], because although we differ on the issue of choice, he has been a champion on funding for child survival issues and the like; but as a tactic, I think the way that the chairman has decided to proceed on this will present huge obstacles to getting our family planning money out there when it is needed.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. We do work together on a number of other issues, but unfortunately, on this one we have a difference.

Let me reiterate, and make this so very clear to everyone who may be listening to this debate, that we will provide family planning funds, as we did during the Reagan and Bush years when we provided in excess of 40 percent of all the subsidies globally for family planning, but we did it in a way that did not promote or perform abortions. That is the key.

Ms. PELOSI. Reclaiming my time and in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me say, if Members abhor abortion, as we all do, they should support family planning and vote against this amendment.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOODLATTE). The gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DORNAN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER], the conscience of the minority party, who is pro-family, pro-defense, and pro-second amendment.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce that I rise in favor of the motion of the gentleman from Alabama, in strong support of it, and I urge the House to adopt this motion.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I hope as Missouri goes, so goes the House.

Mr. Speaker, I also rise in support of what the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] is trying to do, and with great respect for human rights voices like the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI], on the other side of the aisle, and to try and clarify here for the 1,300,000 audience that watches this on C–SPAN that would think we are debating two different issues here today. Everybody suddenly gets up and says they are all against abortion.

Now, a gentleman on the minority side from Illinois held up a penny, so I will hold up a penny. All pennies today are Lincoln pennies. Lincoln, our greatest President from the State of the gentlemen from Illinois, Mr. HYDE and Mr. DURBIN, finally came to realize that the greatest evil in our country since its founding was slavery. We now have great religious leaders all over the world talking about the culture of death in the womb, of the elderly, of the infirm, of the physically challenged.

Since our country first met with the House of Representatives 206 years and 9 months ago, two enormous evils have confronted us: slavery and the taking of innocent life through abortion. There is a benchmark in this House as of November 1: 139 people a few on my side of the aisle, stood up and said that execution-style coup de grace to the base of the skull, removing the brains, partial birth abortion, was OK. Those in the medical profession that do nothing but abort, nothing but abort, and in the other Chamber one of our lady Senators objected to us calling them abortionists instead of doctors. If that is all they do, they are not doctors in this Member's eyes, they are abortionists. So we start with a benchmark of 139 who find even a coup-de-grace abortion OK.

Now we have this group that stands up and says: ''I am against abortion, but do not listen to the pro-lifers on this side or that side of the aisle.'' Money is fungible, down to a penny. If we free up money with all sorts of U.S. restrictions and we know they are not going to be obeyed, then it is going to drive abortion and the political undermining of the laws, and the majority of the 185 nations in the U.N., over 100, will have their laws undermined by these people who are driven almost as a religious conviction about abortion.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. James Timothy McMahon, who with Dr. Haskell worked out partial birth abortion, is buried near my parents in Holy Cross Cemetery in Culver City. I visited that

cemetery Sunday. He renounced his whole life to abortion. Money is fungible, listen to the pro-lifers.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend my colleagues on the Foreign Operations Appropriations Subcommittee for their work on this year's Foreign Operations Appropriations Act (H.R. 2666). On balance, H.R. 2666 moves us in the right direction as we seek to come to grips with the role of the United States in the post-cold war world.

However, I rise to express my opposition to a specific provision adopted by the conference that would impose a moratorium on the use of antipersonnel landmines by the U.S. military.

This provision does nothing to address the problem that led to its adoption—namely, the tens of thousands of unexploded non-self-destructing landmines that are taking a tragic toll on civilian noncombatants around the world. Instead, it unilaterally bars the United States from using a legitimate weapon in combat for defensive purposes while other nations are not similarly restricted.

Even the administration, which has made a global ban on the use of antipersonnel landmines one of its foreign policy objectives, is vigorously opposed to this moratorium. No less an authority than the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Shalikashvili, has noted that ''antipersonnel landmines will be required by U.S. forces for safe defense in the foreseeable future'' and that a prohibition on their use would place American forces at risk.

General Shalikashvili expressed his concerns in a letter to me on September 12. I find his arguments logical and persuasive, and request at this point that a copy of his letter be inserted in the RECORD.

Landmines are an integral part of current U.S. war-fighting doctrine and an important economy of force multiplier. They played a critical role in defending our troops during the decisive final stage of the Persian Gulf war by protecting General Schwartzkopf's forces as they closed in to defeat Saddam Hussein's army deep within Iraqi territory.

The U.S. military uses antipersonnel landmines in strict accordance with the international laws of armed conflict. This moratorium would place unreasonable and unprecedented restrictions on the use of a lawful weapon.

Other countries, most notably China and Russia, have made it clear that they consider landmines to be an integral part of their overall military posture, and have refused to foreswear their use.

In summary, a unilateral moratorium on antipersonnel landmines use by the United States will diminish the U.S. ability to conduct ground combat operations. It would put our soldiers at greater risk and require increased expenditures to maintain an equivalent level of battlefield protection. The potential cost of this moratorium is likely to be measured not only in dollars, but in American soldiers' lives.

We should all oppose this moratorium, and should instead continue to ensure that we provide our fighting men and women in uniform the tools they need to accomplish the missions they are called upon to perform.

THE CHAIRMAN, JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF,
Washington, DC, September 12, 1995.

Hon. FLOYD SPENCE,
Chairman, Committee on National Security, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I solicit your support on the topic of landmines during the forthcoming FY96 Authorization Bill Conference. The proposed legislation in the Senate bill would ban use of anti-personnel landmines by US forces except in narrowly defined scenarios. I have significant concerns because, as written, American personnel would be placed at risk.

The proposed legislation, beginning 3 years after enactment, would prohibit the use for 1 year of anti-personnel landmines by US forces, except in marked and guarded minefields along internationally recognized national borders and demilitarized zones.

The legislation would effectively prohibit the use of all self-destructing mine systems because they employ a combination of anti-tank and anti-personnel mines. Self destructing anti-personnel mines represent approximately 65 percent of the US total anti-personnel mine inventory. Mines were an indispensable component of the coalition's ability to conduct the maneuver warfare that made such an important contribution to victory in DESERT STORM. Significantly, mines secured the right flank of General Schwarzkopf's ground offensive in western Iraq.

I wish to emphasize that mines used by US Armed Forces self-destruct a short period of time after emplacement with a high degree of reliability and do not pose a significant humanitarian problem. Restricting anti-personnel landmines to ''internationally recognized national borders'' and demilitarized zones effectively prohibits their use by US forces in most combat scenarios. Defensive minefields around sensitive military installations such as Naval Station Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, would also be precluded. US forces are heavily dependent upon such minefields for security.

The US military strongly opposes the illegal and irresponsible use of these mines and is a proponent of humanitarian demining activities to alleviate suffering caused by them. However, anti-personnel landmines will be required by US forces for safe defense in the foreseeable future. Congress and the American people expect us to fight and win conflicts with minimum casualties. That goal requires the retention of the capabilities provided by the advanced, self-destructing mine systems which would be prohibited under the proposed legislation.

While I wholeheartedly support US leadership in the long-term goal of anti-personnel landmine elimination, unilateral actions which needlessly place our forces at risk now will not induce good behavior from irresponsible combatants. As practical solutions are pursued, our priorities must be to maintain warfighting superiority while concurrently protecting the safety of US service men and women. I consider this to be a critical force protection issue and request your support to defeat the proposed legislation.

Sincerely,

JOHN M. SHALIKASHVILI,
Chairman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time has expired. Pursuant to House Resolution 296, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN].

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 201, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 850]

YEAS—226

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bereuter
Bevill
Bilirakis
Bliley
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brewster
Browder
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cooley
Costello
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
de la Garza
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Forbes
Fox
Frisa
Funderburk
Gallegly
Geren
Gillmor
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Hostettler
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jacobs
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kasich
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Klink
Knollenberg
LaFalce
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lucas
Manton
Manzullo
Mascara
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McIntosh
McKeon
McNulty
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Ortiz
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pombo
Portman
Poshard
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Regula
Riggs
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Royce
Rush
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shuster
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Stump
Stupak
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Traficant
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff

NAYS—201

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barrett (WI)
Bass
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Berman
Bilbray
Bishop
Blute
Boehlert
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Bryant (TX)
Cardin
Castle
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers

Coyne	Horn	Payne (VA)
Cramer	Houghton	Pelosi
Danner	Hoyer	Peterson (FL)
Davis	Jackson-Lee	Pickett
DeFazio	Jefferson	Pomeroy
DeLauro	Johnson (CT)	Porter
Dellums	Johnson (SD)	Pryce
Deutsch	Johnson, E. B.	Ramstad
Dicks	Johnston	Rangel
Dingell	Kaptur	Reed
Dixon	Kelly	Richardson
Doggett	Kennedy (MA)	Rivers
Dooley	Kennedy (RI)	Rose
Dunn	Kennelly	Roukema
Durbin	Kleczka	Roybal-Allard
Edwards	Klug	Sabo
Engel	Kolbe	Sanders
Eshoo	Lantos	Sawyer
Evans	Lazio	Schiff
Farr	Leach	Schroeder
Fattah	Levin	Schumer
Fawell	Lewis (GA)	Scott
Fazio	Lincoln	Serrano
Fields (LA)	Lofgren	Shays
Filner	Longley	Sisisky
Flake	Lowey	Skaggs
Foglietta	Luther	Slaughter
Foley	Maloney	Smith (TX)
Ford	Markey	Spratt
Fowler	Martinez	Stark
Frank (MA)	Martini	Stokes
Franks (CT)	Matsui	Studds
Franks (NJ)	McCarthy	Thomas
Frelinghuysen	McDermott	Thompson
Frost	McHale	Thornton
Furse	McKinney	Thurman
Ganske	Meehan	Torkildsen
Gejdenson	Meek	Torres
Gekas	Menendez	Torricelli
Gephardt	Meyers	Towns
Gibbons	Miller (CA)	Upton
Gilchrest	Minge	Vento
Gilman	Mink	Visclosky
Gonzalez	Moakley	Ward
Gordon	Molinari	Waters
Green	Moran	Watt (NC)
Greenwood	Morella	Waxman
Gunderson	Nadler	White
Gutierrez	Neal	Williams
Hall (OH)	Nethercutt	Wilson
Harman	Obey	Wise
Hastings (FL)	Olver	Woolsey
Hefner	Owens	Wyden
Hilliard	Pallone	Wynn
Hinchey	Pastor	Yates
Hobson	Payne (NJ)	Zimmer

NOT VOTING—5

Brown (OH)	Mfume	Velazquez
McInnis	Tucker	

□ 1243

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. McInnis for, with Mr. Brown of Ohio against.

Mr. LAZIO of New York and Ms. DUNN of Washington changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. EWING and Mr. KILDEE changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST FURTHER CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1977, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104–403) on the resolution (H. Res. 301) waiving points of order against the further conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 1977) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON FARMINGTON RIVER PURSUANT TO WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS ACT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Resources:

To the Congress of the United States:

I take pleasure in transmitting the enclosed report for the Farmington River in the States of Massachusetts and Connecticut. The report and my recommendations are in response to the provisions of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, Public Law 90–542, as amended. The Farmington River Study was authorized by Public Law 99–590.

The study was conducted by the National Park Service, with invaluable assistance from a congressionally mandated study committee. The National Park Service determined that the 11-mile study segment in Massachusetts and the 14-mile study segment in Connecticut were eligible for designation based upon their free-flowing character and recreational, fish, wildlife and historic values.

The 14-mile Connecticut segment of the river has already been designated as a Wild and Scenic River pursuant to Public Law 103–313, August 26, 1994. The purpose of this transmittal is to inform the Congress that, although eligible for designation, I do not recommend that the Massachusetts segment be designated at this time due to lack of support by the towns adjoining it. If at some future date the towns should change their position and the river has retained its present characteristics, the Congress could reconsider the issue. Also, for 3 years from the date of this transmittal, the Massachusetts segment will remain subject to section 7(b) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. Section 7(b) prohibits licensing of projects by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission and Federal or federally assisted water resource development projects that would have a direct and adverse effect on the values for which the river might be designated. Finally, the report includes the Upper Farmington River Management Plan that is referenced in Public Law 103–313 as the plan by which the designated river will be managed.

The plan demonstrated a true partnership effort of the type that we believe will be increasingly necessary if we are to have affordable protection of our environment in the future.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 13, 1995.*

□ 1245

WAIVING THE PROVISIONS OF CLAUSE 4(b) OF HOUSE RULE XI AGAINST CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS REPORTED FROM THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 297 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 297

Resolved, That the requirement of clause 4(b) of rule XI for a two-thirds vote to consider a report from the Committee on Rules on the same day it is presented to the House is waived with respect to any resolution reported from that committee for the remainder of the first session of the One Hundred Fourth congress providing the territory of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, any amendment thereto, any conference report thereon, or any amendment reported in disagreement from a conference thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY], I know he is going to support this rule which will get all of our Members home by Christmas, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, during the consideration of the resolution, all time yielded, of course, is for debate only.

Mr. Speaker, this rule is similar to rules we granted prior to the Thanksgiving recess for the consideration of general appropriations bills, continuing appropriations resolutions, the debt limit bill, and the Balance Budget Act.

In this instance, we would be waiving clause 4(b) of rule XI, which requires a two-thirds vote for the same day consideration of special rules reported from this committee, for rules that deal with bills, resolutions, amendments, and conference reports dealing with five separate matters:

First, general appropriations bills; second, continuing appropriations measures; third, debt limit measures; fourth, the Balanced Budget Act; and fifth, measures relating to United States troops in Bosnia.

At the request of the minority leadership, we have dropped two provisions from an earlier draft that would have waived the layover requirement for all conference reports and created special suspension days on days other than Mondays and Tuesdays.

As Members may be aware, there is already a standing House rule that permits the same day consideration of special rules for any matter during the last 3 days of a session. But that rule is not activated until we have adopted a

sine die adjournment resolution since that is the only way we can determine with certainly which are the final days of a session.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer to this rule as the ''family friendly, holiday get-away rule'' since we are attempting to expedite the business of this House so that Members can return as soon as possible to their districts and families for their holiday celebrations.

We still have several appropriations matters to complete action on as well as the Balanced Budget Act which is now the subject of negotiations between the Congress and the White House.

The expedited consideration of a possible rule relating to the deployment of United States troops in Bosnia was included in this rule. We anticipate bringing such a rule to the floor today that will make in order up to three measures on Bosnia. This rule permits those measures to be considered today.

The Senate is considering three different measures as well today. It is important that both Houses act today since tomorrow is the signing of the Paris peace agreement in Paris.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that the minority on the Rules Committee expressed the hope that there would be ample time available to see any emergency matters that we do the same-day rules on so that Members can study them before voting—both on the rules and the bills they make in order. We think that is a reasonable request and will do all in our power to see that this emergency authority is not abused.

With that assurance, Mr. Speaker, this rule was adopted by unanimous voice vote in the Rules Committee. I urge that the House follow suit by adopting this rule to permit us to get on with out business in an expeditious fashion.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from New York for yielding me the customary half hour and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in reluctant opposition to this rule.

I am sorry we have to do this rule in the first place. I am sorry my Republican colleagues have not finished the appropriations bills. I am sorry that they spent so much time on the contract on America instead of on the business of the House that the Federal Government actually shut down for 6 days.

But as Walter Cronkite used to say, ''That's the way it is.'' It is the middle of December and five appropriations bills still have not even gotten to the President.

Those appropriations bills are probably Congress' most serious responsibility and I am certainly willing to help my Republican colleagues get them done. But Mr. Speaker, this rule is far too dangerous in fact it is already being misused.

I have just been told that the Rules Committee will be meeting this afternoon to consider a very serious, very far-reaching profound Bosnia resolution that very few people have seen.

Mr. Speaker, we are talking about American lives. We are talking about American national security. We are talking about an awesome responsibility, the responsibility to authorize the President to commit our troops to the peacekeeping effort in Bosnia. This responsibility absolutely must be borne with the gravity and solemn consideration it deserves.

But, Mr. Speaker, the legislation that Members will be asked to vote on, later today, legislation to give the President this authority, has just been written. Mr. Speaker, that is absolutely inexcusable.

And, Mr. Speaker, to make matters worse, the reason we are doing this rule is simply because my Republican colleagues are disastrously behind in the appropriations cycle. This work needs to get done and it needs to get done now. In fact it needed to get done 3 months ago. But not at this price.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this dangerous rule. For matters of this importance, thoughtful, responsible legislating should take precedence over speed.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to come over and vote for this very fair rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 230, nays 186, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 851]

YEAS—230

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Cooley
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis
de la Garza
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Funderburk
Ganske
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Houghton
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lucas
Manzullo
Martini
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Montgomery
Moorhead
Morella
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Petri
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Riggs
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Talent
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Traficant
Upton
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NAYS—186

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Berman
Bevill
Bishop
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Bryant (TX)
Cardin
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Durbin
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Holden
Hoyer
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klink
LaFalce
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lincoln
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manton

Markey	Pastor	Slaughter
Martinez	Payne (NJ)	Spratt
Mascara	Payne (VA)	Stark
Matsui	Pelosi	Stokes
McCarthy	Peterson (FL)	Studds
McDermott	Peterson (MN)	Stupak
McHale	Pickett	Tanner
McKinney	Pomeroy	Taylor (MS)
McNulty	Poshard	Tejeda
Meehan	Rahall	Thompson
Meek	Rangel	Thornton
Menendez	Reed	Thurman
Miller (CA)	Richardson	Torres
Minge	Rivers	Torricelli
Mink	Roemer	Towns
Moakley	Rose	Vento
Mollohan	Roybal-Allard	Visclosky
Moran	Rush	Volkmer
Murtha	Sabo	Ward
Nadler	Sanders	Waters
Neal	Sawyer	Watt (NC)
Oberstar	Schroeder	Waxman
Obey	Schumer	Williams
Olver	Scott	Wise
Ortiz	Serrano	Woolsey
Orton	Sisisky	Wyden
Owens	Skaggs	Wynn
Pallone	Skelton	Yates

NOT VOTING—16

Ballenger	Johnston	Velazquez
Brown (OH)	McInnis	White
Franks (NJ)	Mfume	Whitfield
Gallegly	Schiff	Wilson
Hayes	Stockman	
Hostettler	Tucker	

☐ 1317

Mr. DIXON and Mr. MCNULTY changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST FURTHER CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1977, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules and pursuant to House Resolution 297, I call up House Resolution 301 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 301

Resolved. That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the further conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 1977) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996 and for other purposes. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived.

The conference report shall be considered as read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. PRYCE] is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSON], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for purposes of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the legislation under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is their objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring to the floor today this rule providing for the consideration of the further conference report on H.R. 1977, the Department of the Interior and related agencies appropriations bill for fiscal year 1996. This is a simple, fair rule which waives all points of order against the conference report, and against its consideration.

The blanket waiver includes a waiver of clause 2 of rule XX, as well as a waiver of clause 3 of rule XXVIII, which will permit the House to discuss provisions which may exceed the scope of differences between the House and the Senate.

Under the normal rules of the House, we will have one hour of debate on the conference report itself, in addition to the minority's traditional right to offer a motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, despite recent press reports to the contrary, we are making progress toward completing our work on the thirteen regular appropriations bills. Seven of the thirteen bills have thus far been enacted into law, and passing this bill, and this rule today will bring us one step closer to our goal of balancing the Federal budget and avoiding any unnecessary shutdown of the Federal Government.

Clearly, the task of finishing all of the spending bills on time has not been easy, and the Interior appropriations bill is certainly no exception. Issues related to the development and stewardship of America's natural resources often spark great controversy, as we have seen with regard to mining patents and the management of national forests with this particular piece of legislation.

But, under the leadership of my friend and colleague from Ohio, Mr. REGULA, who is the distinguished chairman of the Interior Subcommittee, the conferees have reached a new a hopefully final agreement on these two very sensitive issues.

First, the conference report continues the existing moratorium on issuing mining patents, and there is no trigger that would cancel the moratorium. Any repeal would be contained in separate mining law reform legislation. In addition, the conference agreement extends the schedule for processing grandfathered applications from 2 to 5 years.

Second, with regard to the Tongass National Forest, it is my understanding that the conference agreement actually lowers the annual harvest ceiling in the forest's current management plan, and maintains the size of the current timber base for 2 years.

I would also add, Mr. Speaker, that in response to the administration's request, conferees restored a significant amount of funding for Indian-related programs. The conference agreement restores a total of $137 million to these programs, which is $27 million above the administration's request.

Other than these modifications, the conference report is essentially unchanged. It still provides funding for the core programs and missions of the agencies covered by this legislation, including funding to operate the National Park System and all of our public lands, and for the health care and education needs of native Americans.

Overall, total spending in this year's conference agreement is more than one billion dollars less than the amount provided in last year's legislation. That is the fiscally responsible thing to do, and I commend Chairman REGULA and members of the Appropriations Committee for crafting a bill that honors our commitment to the American people to achieving meaningful deficit reduction and a limited, but effective Federal Government.

In closing Mr. Speaker, I believe it is only fair and proper that we do everything we can to move the budget and appropriations process forward—not only to keep the Government up and running, but to give future generations of Americans the kind of financial stability and economic prosperity that can only come from a balanced Federal budget.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 301 is the customary rule granted by the Rules Committee this year for conference reports on general appropriations bills, and it is entirely appropriate for this debate. The Rules Committee reported this rule by unanimous voice vote earlier today. I urge my colleagues to adopt the rule and to pass the conference report without any further delay.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we oppose this rule and the measure it makes in order, the conference report on Interior appropriations for fiscal year 1996. As Members know, this is the third time this conference report has been brought to the House floor. Our good friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA], has our greatest respect for the difficult and time-consuming process he has had to endure from the beginning with this bill, but unfortunately, this legislation remains highly objectionable to many of us. Although the new conference report finally extends the moratorium on processing new mining patents for the duration of the fiscal year, as the House has called for through repeated votes, it contains questionable provisions for processing some 370 claims that had reached a certain stage in the patenting process.

On the other issue the conferees were specifically directed to address, the Tongass National Forest, the conference report clearly fails to respond to the House's direction. The new provision would increase timber harvests from an average 315 million board feet annually to 418 million board feet, which is the same amount that would have occurred under the previous version of this legislation.

The rule before us waives all points of order against the conference report and against its consideration. One major reason why the conference report needs such a rule is that it contains numerous violations of clause 2 of rule XXI, the rule that prohibits legislation, that is, policy matters, in an appropriations bill. We acknowledge

that it is very difficult to avoid violating rule XXI entirely in an appropriations bill, but the Committee on Rules usually tries, or we did try, at least, in previous Congresses to minimize the extent to which appropriations bills contain policy matters. Not only did those efforts prevent flagrant intrusions on the jurisdiction of the authorizing committees, but they also kept appropriations bills from getting bogged down in disagreements over issues that are unrelated to the amount of funding being provided to government agencies.

This rule, however, sanctions the use of the appropriations process to make far-reaching changes in policies governing the use of our Nation's resources. It makes it possible for the House to consider a bill that the Los Angeles Times has said is ''swollen with hidden attacks on the public lands, national parks, and the environment.''

Many egregious provisions that were contained in the original conference report remain in the new version. For example, the conference report removes the Mojave preserve in California from the protection of the National Park Service by prohibiting the Park Service from spending more than $1 on it in 1996. New report language accompanying the conference report allows the National Park Service to use a half million dollars to develop a management plan for the east Mohave area which is an increase over the second version of the conference report, but the legislation itself would still shift authority for the area back to the Bureau of Land Management, whose rules are much more lenient than are the Park Service's on mining, grazing, dirt biking, and other potentially detrimental activities.

It prohibits adding new species of plants and animals to the Endangered Species Act list, despite clear scientific evidence that hundreds of species awaiting listing are headed toward extinction. It cripples a joint Forest Service-BLM ecosystem management project for the Columbia River Basin in the Northwest, a project that was intended to allow a sustainable flow of timber from that region. This provision threatens the protection of salmon and other critical species and guarantees continued court battles over logging in that region. It places a moratorium on the development of Federal energy efficiency standards, and it delays implementation of the Interior Department's new grazing regulations.

In addition, this latest version adds a brandnew provision waiving certain environmental laws to expedite the construction of a telescope and supporting infrastructure on Mount Graham on the Coronado National Forest in Arizona, a site that contains rare and valuable ecological resources.

In addition to all these troubling provisions, the conference report endangers resource protection by reducing spending for many critical activities. The conference report cuts spending on the Interior Department and related agencies as a whole by 10 percent from this year's level, but within that reduction are much more severe cuts in many valuable programs, including wildlife protection, energy conservation, land acquisition, support for the arts and humanities, and support for native Americans, despite the modest increase in the new version for that issue.

Mr. Speaker, these are programs that do an enormous amount of good for our Nation for a relatively small sum, and they ought to be sustained at adequate levels. These are also programs that are strongly supported by the American people. I recently sent a survey to my own constituents asking them to chose what they would cut from a list of virtually everything the Federal Government spends money on.

In response, and there were about 20,000 voters in our area who responded, and even though they wanted us to cut spending in many other areas, a full 87 percent, Mr. Speaker, 87 percent of the respondents opposed cutting spending on national parks, forests, and wildlife refuges. Eighty percent opposed cutting spending on environmental protection, 78 percent opposed cutting energy conservation and other energy research programs, and 59 percent opposed cutting Federal support for the arts and humanities. I have little doubt that if the same questions were asked almost anywhere else in the country, the results would be close to the ones that I received.

Defenders of these cuts, Mr. Speaker, say they are necessary to help balance the budget, but in fact, the $1.4 billion cut this bill makes from last year's level of spending is necessary only in the sense that the majority's budget plan needs it to help pay for the defense appropriations bill's additional $7 billion in spending that Pentagon officials themselves say they do not want or need.

□ 1330

It is necessary only because the majority's budget plan needs it to help pay for a 7-year, $245 billion tax cut that the vast majority of Americans believe should not be provided until the Federal budget is actually balanced.

The real significance of this legislation is not its contribution to reducing the Federal budget deficit but rather its contribution to the comprehensive assault on environmental protection that has been launched by the Republican leadership in the House. When this legislation is viewed in the context of other antienvironmental measures the House has already passed, its negative impacts are even more apparent.

This conference report follows House passage of several so-called regulatory reform bills, the Contract With America bills that would cripple Federal regulatory agencies' ability to implement and enforce environmental protection laws.

It follows House passage of the amendments to the Clean Water Act that would permit more water pollution and allow the destruction of more than half the Nation's remaining wetlands.

It follows enactment of a provision included in the fiscal 1995 rescission bill which already has dramatically increased logging in national forests.

It follows House passage of an appropriations bill that cuts funding dramatically for the Environmental Protection Agency.

It follows House passage of the budget reconciliation bill that would open the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to oil and gas drilling, and would provide special deals for industries that want to use the natural resources that belong to all Americans—mining, ranching, timber, and oil and gas interests—and special deals for concessionaires in our national parks.

Mr. Speaker, to repeat, the conference report this rule makes in order is severely flawed. It fails to provide the necessary funding and safeguards for our Nation's natural resources that the American people overwhelmingly want us to provide.

I urge Members to vote ''no'' on the rule and ''no'' on the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY], the ranking member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule. And, Mr. Speaker, every single Member of this House who voted for a constitutional amendment to balance the budget should oppose this rule.

Now is the time for Members who voted to balance the budget, no matter what the cost no matter how painful, to show that they mean what they say. Now is the time for my Republican colleagues to show that they can live within their own budget.

Because, Mr. Speaker, this bill is a budget buster. This bill will cost $21 million more than my Republican colleagues said this country could afford. It is $21 million over budget and $21 million over the 602b allocation.

Mr. Speaker, I want to state for the RECORD that never, in the history of Democratic control of the House did we waive the 602b requirement on an appropriations conference report. Every single one of our appropriations conference reports stayed well within its limits. I wonder why my Republican colleagues cannot do the same and I wonder how on Earth they can vote for this rule.

I urge my colleagues to defeat this rule. If you voted to balance the budget, now is your chance to do so.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to

the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], the ranking member of the Appropriations Subcommittee.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time, and I want to congratulate him upon a magnificent and accurate statement of what this bill contains and why it should be defeated.

But I rise, Mr. Speaker, to read from a book review that appeared in the Washington Post last August on a book that is entitled ''The Making of a Conservative Environmentalist'':

In 1992, an American-Canadian agency charged with overseeing the health of the Great Lakes surprised the White House, never mind governors in 8 States bordering the lakes, by making a radical proposal. Convinced that the toxic by-products of chlorine-based industrial compounds were harming wildlife and perhaps poisoning people, the panel called for phasing out one of the basic chemical feedstocks of modern manufacturing straight elemental chlorine.

One might assume that the man behind such a noble gambit was a learned statesman and veteran environmentalist. Hardly. The recommendation's main champion was Gordon K. Durnil, the panel's American chairman, a Rush Limbaugh-loving conservative Republican from Indiana.

Here was a plain, middle-aged guy who freely admits that before being appointed by George Bush in 1989 to the International Joint Commission, a little-known but influential oversight agency that watches the Great Lakes—

He had done little. Those last few words are mine, but I go back to the quote.

In fact, Mr. Durnil acknowledges in ''The Making of a Conservative Environmentalist'' that he possessed absolutely no qualifications for one of the continent's senior environmental posts, other than having served as Republican Party chairman in Indiana and cultivated a close political friendship with former Vice President Dan Quayle.

How could such a naif advance one of the single boldest environmental policy ideas of the 1990s? The answer, we are told, is a simple tale of personal discovery. A Midwestern party operative late in life suddenly awakens to find truth in the popular concern for the safety of the earth. The message is that someone as conventional and as conservative as Mr. Durnil can latch on to one of the great social transformations of the American century, then so can every other Republican in the country.

The fact that they have not, particularly this year when Republican leaders in the House and the Senate are desperately trying to unravel 25 years of environmental regulation, has Mr. Durnil in a gentlemanly lather—

And so forth. It continues.

The reason I read that, of course, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that Mr. Durnil would have been very much upset by the attack that our bill makes upon the natural resources of our country.

A third more of our ancient forests are being cut in this bill than were authorized for cutting in the previous bill. The Indian people have not received the kind of funding that they should have received, in spite of the fact that additional funds were made available in the last session of the conference committee. Environmental damage is being done to our forests, to our streams, to our parks, to every other natural resource.

I would urge, Mr. Speaker, that the rule be defeated, and if the rule is not defeated, that the bill then be defeated.

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA], the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REGULA. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. I might say that Mr. Durnil could very well come from Ohio as well as from Indiana.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, a lot of conservative environmentalists come from Ohio.

Mr. YATES. That is true. I wonder why they are not on the committee.

Mr. REGULA. I think one of them chairs it.

Mr. Speaker, I am intrigued by the gentleman from Massachusetts complaining that we are spending too much money. It is the new math that we have in Washington, DC, as near as I can figure out, since this bill is $1.3 billion less than in 1995. It is about a 10-percent reduction from 1995 funding. It is responsive to the movement to a balanced budget.

We have had to make tough decisions, of course. But as I have said previously, we divided the responsibilities into three parts: The must-do's, the need-to-do's, and the nice-to-do's.

The must-do's we took care of. We kept the parks at level funding, the forests at level funding and operations. The Smithsonian, the National Gallery, the Kennedy Center, the things that the people enjoy, that they want to use, are nearly level-funded.

Certainly, in order to save $1.3 billion, we had to eliminate or substantially downsize some other activities. But I simply point out again that in terms of the budget and the deficit reduction which I think the American people very much want to see, this bill is extremely responsible. I do not think that in any way it is environmentally detrimental.

It responds to the motion to recommit. We have made adjustments on the mining issue of the moratorium. We have made adjustments on Tongass. All the parties involved and both sides worked on the language, and I will address that more in the general debate.

On the matter of the Indians, we have added $50 million, $25 million for health services, $25 million for tribal priorities. In fact, this is more than the administration requested. They wanted something like $125 million over the Senate level. We are at about $111 million over the Senate level.

So I think we have a very responsible bill here. I hope that the Members will support the rule, I hope that the Members will support the bill, and that the administration will sign it.

There are 130,000 employees that are directly affected by this bill, and what a great gift we could give them by passing this excellent, responsible bill that has been developed with a lot of give-and-take, so that those 130,000 employees would know on Friday that their jobs would be secure, that they can go out and open the gates to the parks, to the forests, to the Smithsonian, to the fish and wildlife facilities.

If Members are concerned about the environment, the way to support the environmental issues is to vote for this bill so the funding will be available to these dedicated people who do truly take care of the environment as they provide the services in the Department of the Interior, to the cultural institutions, to the Department of Energy.

I would strongly urge the Members to support the rule and support the bill. I think, given the restraints that we had on the funding levels, that we have done a responsible job of meeting the needs of this Nation.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I think every Member of the House needs to know that if you vote for this rule today and if you vote for this bill today, you will be voting to bust the budget.

Just a week ago, on December 5, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] filed on behalf of the Committee on Appropriations the Report on Budget Allocations Between Subcommittees as required by 602 of the Budget Act. That act sets the ceiling above which no appropriation bill may go without being subjected to being knocked off the floor by a point of order lodged by any Member.

Yet 1 week after they did that, and just a few short days before we are going to confront the need for a continuing resolution, or else see the Government shut down because the Speaker of the House is still at this point talking about using the leverage of the continuing resolution to force settlement of the overall budget issues, in the long-range budget talks that are now taking place, after being told that that is important enough to shut the Government down to get to a balanced budget, we are being asked to pass a proposition here today which busts the budget.

□ 1345

The filing by the committee on December 5 indicated that the ceiling for spending in this bill would be $12,213,000,000 in budget authority. The ceiling reported in this bill, 8 days later, is $12,234,476,000. That means it is $21.5 million above the allowable ceiling.

Now, we tried on three different occasions to get the committee to adopt a different 602 allocation to make room for additional funding in this and other bills. We were turned down by the majority in the committee, and yet today

we are being asked to put that limitation aside.

I would ask Members of the House on both sides of the aisle, how many times do you remember having the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] come to the House floor and berate the then majority Democratic Party for waiving budget rules when they brought rules to the floor under which appropriation bills would be debated? the answer is time and time and time again we were told by the gentleman from Pennsylvania and many others that we were waiving the Budget Act. Now, today, we are being asked not only to waive the Budget Act, but to waive spending ceilings within that budget.

If you take a look at the history of this House on regular appropriation bills, you will find that it ha been a rare experience, indeed, when we were asked on a regular appropriation bill to waive those ceilings. It just seems to me that when we are facing a situation which may lead again to a Government shutdown, it is a very odd thing, indeed, for the committee to ask us to bust the budget ceiling to the tune of $21.5 billion. I do not think that is the orderly way to proceed. A much better way to proceed would have been to adjust those 602 allocations so that we are behaving as we are supposed to behave in a situation like this.

I also make the point this rule will allow us to proceed to consideration of a bill which allows for a significant increase in timber cutting in the Tongass Forest, one of a handful of temperate rain forests in the entire world, and yet this bill is going to accelerate that cutting. I do not believe we ought to do that. I do not think most persons concerned with preserving the environment think we ought to do that, certainly not in this appropriation bill.

So I would urge both on environmental grounds and because this bill breaks the very budget ceilings which were imposed on us just 8 days ago by the majority party, I would urge Members to vote ''no'' on the rule.

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

(Mr. LIVINGSTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I listened attentively to my friend from Wisconsin who, throughout this last year, has been complaining that we have not been spending enough money on one program or another, on babies, on children, on old people, on Indians. The gentleman from Illinois sitting over there wants to help the Indians. In fact, the administration wanted to help the Indians, too. They wanted at the outset of the conference $110 million above the Senate level to help the Indians.

This bill provides, I think, $137 million for the Indians above the Senate level. This bill provides more than the administration asked for them, and still the administration is threatening to veto it because now they still say there is not enough money for the Indians.

The gentleman from Illinois is opposing it because there is not enough money for the Indians. The gentleman from Wisconsin has opposed this bill because we are not spending enough money. He is not here arguing against the bill. He is just saying, well, we technically exceeded our budget allocations. Well, we did, in trying to accommodate his side, in trying to accommodate his administration, and we can cure the technicality, we can rearrange the budget allocations. In fact, we are in the process of working on that, and that is a technical glitch, and technically we are in error.

But do not say that we are not spending enough money and then attack us because we spent too much money. It does not make sense. But that is the position of the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, that is not the position of the gentleman from Wisconsin. The position of the gentleman from Wisconsin is that if we have budget ceilings, we ought to live by them. But in my view, as you know, I tried twice or three times in the committee to try to adjust those ceilings in the proper way so that we could get that money from another place. I do not believe in busting the budget in order to fund the Interior bill. What I do believe is bills that are too high should be brought down to make room for the spending in this bill. I do not believe in spending $7 billion more than the White House asked on the military budget and then also exceeding the spending authority in this bill.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman knows the Defense budget has been enacted into law. I think it called for spending about $400 million less than we spent last year, even though the administration wanted $700 million less than we appropriated, and he still wanted to send the troops to Bosnia. But the Defense bill is not before us.

The gentleman is technically correct. I concede the gentleman's technical assertion. He is absolutely technically correct, but substantively we are giving him more money than he asked for in the first place. This is a ridiculous objection.

I urge adoption of the rule.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in opposition to the Interior appropriations conference report for fiscal year 1996. One of the main reasons for my opposition is the severe cuts to the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities. For a modest investment of $162 million, the preservation of our cultural resources outweigh the small cost to the government each year.

Recently, this Republican Congress proposed the elimination of Federal funding for these institutions. The purpose of these agencies is to provide support for arts organizations. In turn, these groups offer the community many activities such as plays, festivals, and seminars that cannot occur without Federal assistance. Furthermore, no arts organizations receive grants from the NEA or the NEH without providing matching funds.

On July 17, the House voted to approve the fiscal year 1996 Interior appropriations bill which cut Federal funding to the National Endowment for the Arts by 40 percent, leaving only $99 million. There were three amendments to the bill which would have cut all funding to the endowment and thus, completely phase out the agency at the end of this year. Fortunately, bipartisan efforts defeated the amendments.

However, in this era of Federal budget constraints, every Federal program, whether it is worthy or not, is subject to cuts. While we must work toward a balanced budget, we must not make indiscriminate and arbitrary cuts in the NEA budget. Recently, Chairman Jane Alexander has had to implement a 47 percent reduction of staff. Because of these reductions, the number of applications will have to be significantly cut and viable arts organizations will be hurt.

During my tenure in the California legislature, I continually met with business leaders who supported the arts. I believe that support for the arts is essential and contributes to our economic edge. The same hands that mold clay or play the piano can also program computers and start new businesses. It is our creativity which must be nurtured from an early age. We cannot afford to abolish the NEA and the NEH. It is an investment in our future.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 231, nays 188, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 852]

YEAS—231

Allard	Barton	Bonilla
Archer	Bass	Bono
Armey	Bateman	Brownback
Bachus	Bereuter	Bryant (TN)
Baker (CA)	Bilbray	Bunn
Baker (LA)	Bilirakis	Bunning
Ballenger	Bliley	Burr
Barr	Blute	Burton
Barrett (NE)	Boehlert	Callahan
Bartlett	Boehner	Calvert

Camp
Canady
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cooley
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Funderburk
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lucas
Manzullo
Martini
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Moorhead
Morella
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Petri
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Riggs
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tate
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Traficant
Upton
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NAYS—188

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Berman
Bevill
Bishop
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Bryant (TX)
Cardin
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Durbin
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Holden
Hoyer
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klink
LaFalce
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lincoln
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Richardson
Rivers
Roemer
Rose
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Williams
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NOT VOTING—13

Brewster
Brown (OH)
Buyer
Dickey
McInnis
Menendez
Mfume
Sisisky
Smith (NJ)
Tauzin
Tucker
Velazquez
Wilson

□ 1413

Mr. ORTIZ changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1745, UTAH PUBLIC LANDS MANAGEMENT ACT OF 1995

Ms. PRYCE, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104–404) on the resolution (H. Res. 303) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1745) to designate certain public lands in the State of Utah as wilderness, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

□ 1415

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1977, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 301, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 1977) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Pursuant to House Resolution 301, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of December 12, 1995 at page H14288.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA].

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, this is the conference report on Interior. As my colleagues know, it was recommitted once on the question of the moratorium on mining, and the second time on the mining issue and also on the Tongass timber program.

Mr. Speaker, the questions on mining and the Tongass, I will address, but let me say at the outset I think what we have is a very fair bill. For example, we had dozens and dozens of requests from Members for various things that might impact in their districts, and the number on the Democratic side that we responded to is actually a few more than on the Republican side. We made an effort to respond on the merits of the issues without regard to partisanship, and I would hope that my colleagues on the minority side would support this legislation. I think likewise that the majority Members should do the same, and I think, as I explain what we made in the way of changes, that my colleagues will understand we have responded to the concerns of the Members.

Also I think it is very important that we get this bill down to the President, and I would hope he would sign it. There are 130,000 employees who are waiting and hoping that this legislation will become law so they can get on with the job of managing the parks, keeping the gates open for the public to enjoy these wonderful facilities; likewise in managing our forests, our public lands, the grazing lands, the fish and wildlife facilities, the Smithsonian, the National Gallery. Many of my colleagues probably had their visitors here experience the fact that the doors were closed on the Smithsonian, the National Gallery, the Kennedy Center during the period of time, the 5 days or so, that we did not have funding, and, if we can get this conference report passed in the House and the Senate, get it to the President, I think to examine the merits of the bill, that the executive branch, the President, will recognize that we have been as fair as possible, that we have addressed the problems.

I want to say also at the outset that there is some talk about a budget buster. That has got to be the new math in this town, because this bill is $1.3 billion under 1995 in budget authority. It

is about 10 percent below 1995, and it causes some tough decisions, but if we are to get to a balanced budget in 7 years, we have to look at each expenditure and say can we do this more efficiently, and we have tried to apply the policies of total quality management to the responsibilities that we have.

Let me address the issues that caused the recommittal, the first being the Tongass, the rain forest in the State of Alaska. A statement was made during the debate on the rule that actually we were increasing the cut. Exactly the opposite is happening. In the modified language, which I might say was worked over and agreed to by both sides of this issue on the Tongass, we reduced the allowable cut from 450 million board feet to 418 million board feet in the Tongass, so this is a reduction of the amount that can be allowed as far as cutting the timber. The practical matter is that the money in the bill, because of reduced funding, is only enough to allow for about 310 million board feet, and the same will likely be true in the 1997 bill. So, as far as the amount of cut that is allowed, it is substantially below what had been allowed prior to this time, so I think that is one of the ways we responded to those who have a concern for the Tongass.

Second, we removed the sufficiency language. Sufficiency language insulates actions from the courts from the requirements for environmental evaluation, and in the original bill that was language that was placed in there by the other body. We remove that so that the cuts in the Tongass, with one exception, are subject to all the rules, regulations, the actions of the courts, the Environmental Protection Agency, the endangered species law, the whole 9 yards, and therefore I think for those who are concerned about the environmental impacts, Mr. Speaker, we have made every effort to insure that environmental concerns are addressed. The one sale has already gone through all this, and we would allow that sale to be transferred to another buyer.

We have also allowed the planning process by the Forest Service to continue. They can go forward in their planning process to determine what should be the allowable cut and how it should be handled in the future, and that plan, we would hope, would be developed in the next several months. We give the Department a totally free hand in the planning process.

We removed the language concerning the Goshawk and permanently prohibiting establishing certain habitat conservable areas. The administration strongly objected to this permanent provision and it has been deleted.

I think on balance what we have done in the Tongass represents a very good compromise between those who are concerned about providing the jobs in Alaska, allowing a cut, and those who want to protect the environment, protect this forest, and as I said earlier, this represents a compromise among the interested parties.

On the mining issue, which was also part of the motion to recommit, we removed the triggers that would lift the moratorium so what we have is a moratorium with no triggers. We also provide that the Department of Interior, or BLM, has a 5-year period to process the grandfathered patents, and I know that is of an interest to those who have concern about the mining proposals. But, the moratorium that has been in place in the 1995 bill remains in place in the 1996 bill, and I think this is the important fact that I want to convey to all members:

We responded to the motion to recommit exactly as has been requested in that motion. It also provides that the Secretary of Interior should give us a report in the year as to what success they are having in getting the grandfather patents in which people have a proprietary interest effectuated or out to the applicants.

On the question of the Indians, I know the gentleman from Wisconsin, the minority leader on the Committee on Appropriations, was concerned about adequate funding for the Indians, and we had a request from the administration. Actually they requested $110 million over the Senate level. We end up here with $11 million. We have added $50 million from the second conference report to this one, $25 for tribal priorities. This allows the Indian tribes to use these funds in the way that will best serve their individual tribes and the people that are members thereof, and we put $25 million in Indian health, recognizing again that this is extremely important as we discharge our responsibility. One of the treaty obligations, the really true major obligations we have under the treaties, one is to provide health services, and the second is to provide education, and we have addressed those, and we have added the $50 million.

We have some other changes in the conference report. They are not big items, and I would be happy to address those in response to any questions. One of these would be requested by the Department of Interior, to allow them to work out agreements in cooperation with other levels of government. Also, a requirement that limits the log exports for an additional period of time in the Western States, and most of the other changes were agreed on, but I think the important thing I want to impress on the Members is that we responded to the motion to recommit. On the Tongass, on the mining moratorium, we responded in a way in which I think those who are interested parties will tell the Members during this debate that they are very well pleased with what we have been able to do, and the bill itself, I believe, responds, given the fiscal constraints we had, very effectively in meeting the needs of the people.

So I would hope that we can get this passed and get on with it. our responsibilities, and we can say to those 130,000 employees, ''We know your job is important, we know the public depends on you to provide the services in the parks, the forests and so on, and we want to let you know that we are behind you by supporting this legislation.''

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD include a table on the various accounts in the bill, as agreed to by the conference managers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The table on the various accounts in the bill is as follows:

FY 1996 INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 1977)

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR						
Bureau of Land Management						
Management of lands and resources	597,236,000	616,547,000	570,017,000	563,936,000	568,062,000	-29,174,000
Fire protection	114,748,000	114,763,000	.....	.....	.....	-114,748,000
Emergency Department of the Interior firefighting fund	121,176,000	131,462,000	.....	.....	.....	-121,176,000
Wildland fire management	.....	.....	235,924,000	240,159,000	235,924,000	+235,924,000
Central hazmat account	13,409,000	14,024,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	-3,409,000
Construction and access	12,068,000	3,019,000	2,515,000	2,615,000	3,115,000	-8,953,000
Payments in lieu of taxes	101,409,000	113,911,000	111,409,000	100,000,000	101,500,000	+91,000
Land acquisition	14,757,000	24,473,000	8,500,000	10,550,000	12,800,000	-1,957,000
Oregon and California grant lands	97,364,000	112,752,000	91,387,000	95,364,000	93,379,000	-3,985,000
Range improvements (indefinite)	10,350,000	9,113,000	9,113,000	9,113,000	9,113,000	-1,237,000
Service charges, deposits, and forfeitures (indefinite)	8,883,000	8,993,000	8,993,000	8,993,000	8,993,000	+110,000
Miscellaneous trust funds (indefinite)	7,605,000	7,605,000	7,605,000	7,605,000	7,605,000	.....
Total, Bureau of Land Management	1,099,005,000	1,156,682,000	1,055,463,000	1,048,335,000	1,050,491,000	-48,514,000
United States Fish and Wildlife Service						
Resource management	511,334,000	535,018,000	497,150,000	501,478,000	497,943,000	-13,391,000
Construction	53,768,000	34,095,000	28,355,000	38,775,000	37,655,000	-16,113,000
Natural resource damage assessment and restoration fund	6,687,000	6,700,000	6,019,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	-2,687,000
Land acquisition	67,141,000	62,912,000	14,100,000	32,031,000	36,900,000	-30,241,000
Cooperative endangered species conservation fund	8,983,000	36,000,000	8,085,000	8,085,000	8,085,000	-898,000
National wildlife refuge fund	11,977,000	11,371,000	10,779,000	10,779,000	10,779,000	-1,198,000
Rewards and operations	1,167,000	1,169,000	600,000	600,000	600,000	-567,000
North American wetlands conservation fund	8,983,000	12,000,000	4,500,000	6,750,000	6,750,000	-2,233,000
Lahonton Valley and Pyramid Lake fish and wildlife fund	.....	152,000	152,000	152,000	152,000	+152,000
Rhinoceros and tiger conservation fund	.....	400,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	+200,000
Wildlife conservation and appreciation fund	998,000	1,000,000	998,000	800,000	800,000	-198,000
Total, United States Fish and Wildlife Service	671,038,000	702,817,000	568,938,000	603,650,000	603,864,000	-67,174,000
Natural Resources Science Agency						
Research, inventories, and surveys	162,041,000	172,696,000	.....	145,965,000	.....	-162,041,000
National Park Service						
Operation of the national park system	1,077,900,000	1,157,738,000	1,088,249,000	1,092,265,000	1,083,151,000	+5,251,000
National recreation and preservation	42,941,000	39,305,000	35,725,000	38,094,000	37,649,000	-5,292,000
Historic preservation fund	41,421,000	43,000,000	37,934,000	38,312,000	36,212,000	-5,209,000
Construction	167,688,000	179,883,000	114,868,000	116,480,000	143,225,000	-24,463,000
Urban park and recreation fund	6,000	2,300,000	.....	.....	.....	-6,000
Land and water conservation fund (rescission of contract authority)	-30,000,000	-30,000,000	-30,000,000	-30,000,000	-30,000,000	.....
Land acquisition and state assistance	87,373,000	82,898,000	14,300,000	45,187,000	49,100,000	-38,273,000
Crime Trust Fund	.....	15,200,000	.....	.....	.....	.....
Total, National Park Service (net)	1,387,329,000	1,490,122,000	1,261,076,000	1,300,338,000	1,319,337,000	-67,992,000
United States Geological Survey						
Surveys, investigations, and research	571,462,000	586,369,000	686,944,000	577,503,000	730,503,000	+159,041,000
Minerals Management Service						
Royalty and offshore minerals management	188,181,000	193,348,000	186,556,000	182,169,000	182,994,000	-5,187,000
Oil spill research	6,440,000	7,892,000	6,440,000	6,440,000	6,440,000	.....
Total, Minerals Management Service	194,621,000	201,240,000	192,996,000	188,609,000	189,434,000	-5,187,000
Bureau of Mines						
Mines and minerals	152,427,000	132,507,000	87,000,000	128,007,000	64,000,000	-88,427,000
Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement						
Regulation and technology	109,795,000	107,152,000	92,751,000	95,470,000	95,470,000	-14,325,000
Receipts from performance bond forfeitures (indefinite)	1,189,000	501,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	-689,000
Subtotal	110,984,000	107,653,000	93,251,000	95,970,000	95,970,000	-15,014,000
Abandoned mine reclamation fund (definite, trust fund)	182,423,000	185,120,000	176,327,000	170,441,000	173,887,000	-8,536,000
Total, Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement	293,407,000	292,773,000	269,578,000	266,411,000	269,857,000	-23,550,000

FY 1996 INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 1977) — continued

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
Bureau of Indian Affairs						
Operation of Indian programs	1,519,012,000	1,609,842,000	1,509,626,000	1,261,234,000	1,384,434,000	-134,578,000
Construction	120,450,000	125,424,000	98,033,000	107,333,000	100,833,000	-19,617,000
Indian land and water claim settlements and miscellaneous payments to Indians	77,096,000	151,025,000	75,145,000	82,745,000	80,645,000	+3,549,000
Navajo rehabilitation trust fund	1,996,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-1,996,000
Technical assistance of Indian enterprises	1,966,000	1,966,000	.....	900,000	500,000	-1,466,000
Indian direct loan program account	779,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-779,000
(Limitation on direct loans)	(10,890,000)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(-10,890,000)
Indian guaranteed loan program account	9,671,000	9,684,000	.....	7,700,000	5,000,000	-4,671,000
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(46,900,000)	(70,100,000)	.....	(50,680,000)	(35,914,000)	(-10,986,000)
Total, Bureau of Indian Affairs	1,730,970,000	1,897,941,000	1,682,806,000	1,459,912,000	1,571,412,000	-159,558,000
Territorial and International Affairs						
Assistance to territories	50,481,000	41,512,000	24,685,000	40,468,000	37,468,000	-13,013,000
Northern Mariana Islands Covenant	27,720,000	27,720,000	27,720,000	27,720,000	27,720,000	.....
Subtotal	78,201,000	69,232,000	52,405,000	68,188,000	65,188,000	-13,013,000
Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands	19,800,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-19,800,000
Compact of Free Association	13,574,000	10,038,000	14,618,000	10,038,000	10,038,000	-3,536,000
Mandatory payments	10,000,000	14,900,000	14,900,000	14,900,000	14,900,000	+4,900,000
Subtotal	23,574,000	24,938,000	29,518,000	24,938,000	24,938,000	+1,364,000
Total, Territorial and International Affairs	121,575,000	94,170,000	81,923,000	93,126,000	90,126,000	-31,449,000
Departmental Offices						
Departmental management	62,479,000	64,772,000	53,919,000	57,796,000	57,796,000	-4,683,000
Office of the Solicitor	34,608,000	35,361,000	34,608,000	34,608,000	34,608,000	.....
Office of Inspector General	23,939,000	25,485,000	23,939,000	23,939,000	23,939,000	.....
Construction Management	1,996,000	2,000,000	.....	500,000	500,000	-1,496,000
National Indian Gaming Commission	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	.....
Office of Special Trustee for American Indians	.....	.....	.....	16,338,000	16,338,000	+16,338,000
Total, Departmental Offices	124,022,000	128,618,000	113,466,000	134,181,000	134,181,000	+10,159,000
Total, title I, Department of the Interior:						
New budget (obligational) authority (net)	6,507,897,000	6,855,935,000	6,000,190,000	5,946,037,000	6,023,205,000	-484,692,000
Appropriations	(6,537,897,000)	(6,870,735,000)	(6,030,190,000)	(5,976,037,000)	(6,053,205,000)	(-484,692,000)
Rescission	(-30,000,000)	(-30,000,000)	(-30,000,000)	(-30,000,000)	(-30,000,000)	.....
Crime trust fund	.....	(15,200,000)	.....	.....	.....	.....
(Limitation on direct loans)	(10,890,000)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(-10,890,000)
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(46,900,000)	(70,100,000)	.....	(50,680,000)	(35,914,000)	(-10,986,000)
TITLE II - RELATED AGENCIES						
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE						
Forest Service						
Forest research	193,748,000	203,796,000	182,000,000	177,000,000	178,000,000	-15,748,000
State and private forestry	154,268,000	187,459,000	129,551,000	136,794,000	136,794,000	-17,474,000
Emergency pest suppression fund	17,000,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-17,000,000
International forestry	4,987,000	10,000,000	.....	.....	.....	-4,987,000
National forest system	1,328,893,000	1,348,755,000	1,266,688,000	1,247,543,000	1,256,253,000	-72,640,000
Forest Service fire protection	159,285,000	164,285,000	.....	.....	.....	-159,285,000
Emergency Forest Service firefighting fund	228,200,000	239,000,000	.....	.....	.....	-228,200,000
Emergency appropriations	450,000,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-450,000,000
Wildland Fire Management	.....	.....	385,485,000	381,485,000	385,485,000	+385,485,000
Construction	199,215,000	192,338,000	120,000,000	186,888,000	163,500,000	-35,715,000
Timber receipts transfer to general fund (indefinite)	(-44,769,000)	(-44,548,000)	(-44,548,000)	(-44,548,000)	(-44,548,000)	(+221,000)
Timber purchaser credits	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	.....
Land acquisition	63,882,000	65,311,000	14,600,000	41,187,000	41,200,000	-22,682,000
Acquisition of lands for national forests, special acts	1,250,000	1,317,000	1,069,000	1,069,000	1,069,000	-181,000
Acquisition of lands to complete land exchanges (indefinite)	210,000	210,000	210,000	210,000	210,000	.....
Range betterment fund (indefinite)	4,575,000	3,976,000	3,976,000	3,976,000	3,976,000	-599,000
Gifts, donations and bequests for forest and rangeland research	89,000	92,000	92,000	92,000	92,000	+3,000
Total, Forest Service	2,803,602,000	2,416,539,000	2,103,671,000	2,176,224,000	2,166,579,000	-637,023,000
DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY						
Clean coal technology	-337,879,000	-155,019,000	.....	.....	.....	+337,879,000
Fossil energy research and development	423,701,000	436,508,000	379,524,000	376,181,000	417,169,000	-6,532,000
(By transfer)	(17,000,000)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(-17,000,000)
Alternative fuels production (indefinite)	-3,900,000	-2,400,000	-2,400,000	-2,400,000	-2,400,000	+1,500,000
Naval petroleum and oil shale reserves	187,048,000	101,028,000	151,028,000	136,028,000	148,786,000	-38,262,000
Energy conservation	755,751,000	923,561,000	556,371,000	576,976,000	553,293,000	-202,458,000
Biomass Energy Development (transfer)	.....	-16,000,000	-16,000,000	-16,000,000	-16,000,000	-16,000,000

FY 1996 INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 1977) — continued

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
Economic regulation	12,413,000	10,500,000	6,297,000	8,036,000	6,297,000	-6,116,000
Emergency preparedness	8,233,000	8,219,000				-8,233,000
Strategic Petroleum Reserve	135,954,000	25,689,000				-135,954,000
(By transfer)	(90,764,000)	(167,000,000)	(167,000,000)	(167,000,000)	(167,000,000)	(+96,236,000)
Energy Information Administration	84,566,000	84,689,000	79,766,000	64,766,000	72,266,000	-12,300,000
Total, Department of Energy	1,265,687,000	1,416,775,000	1,154,586,000	1,143,589,000	1,179,411,000	-86,476,000
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES						
Indian Health Service						
Indian health services	1,709,780,000	1,816,350,000	1,725,792,000	1,815,373,000	1,747,842,000	+38,062,000
Indian health facilities	253,282,000	242,672,000	236,975,000	151,227,000	238,958,000	-14,324,000
Total, Indian Health Service	1,963,062,000	2,059,022,000	1,962,767,000	1,966,600,000	1,986,800,000	+23,738,000
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION						
Office of Elementary and Secondary Education						
Indian education	81,341,000	84,785,000	52,500,000	54,660,000	52,500,000	-28,841,000
OTHER RELATED AGENCIES						
Office of Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation						
Salaries and expenses	24,888,000	26,345,000	21,345,000	20,345,000	20,345,000	-4,543,000
Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development						
Payment to the Institute	11,213,000	19,846,000	5,500,000	5,500,000	5,500,000	-5,713,000
Smithsonian Institution						
Salaries and expenses	313,853,000	329,800,000	309,471,000	307,968,000	308,188,000	-5,665,000
Construction and improvements, National Zoological Park	3,042,000	4,950,000	3,000,000	3,250,000	3,250,000	+208,000
Repair and restoration of buildings	23,954,000	34,000,000	24,954,000	33,954,000	33,954,000	+10,000,000
Construction	21,857,000	36,700,000	12,950,000	27,700,000	27,700,000	+5,843,000
Total, Smithsonian Institution	362,706,000	407,450,000	350,375,000	372,892,000	373,092,000	+10,386,000
National Gallery of Art						
Salaries and expenses	52,902,000	54,566,000	51,315,000	51,844,000	51,844,000	-1,058,000
Repair, restoration and renovation of buildings	4,016,000	9,885,000	5,500,000	7,385,000	6,442,000	+2,426,000
Total, National Gallery of Art	56,918,000	64,451,000	56,815,000	59,229,000	58,286,000	+1,368,000
John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts						
Operations and maintenance	10,323,000	10,373,000	9,800,000	10,323,000	10,323,000	
Construction	8,983,000	9,000,000	8,983,000	8,983,000	8,983,000	
Total, John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts	19,306,000	19,373,000	18,783,000	19,306,000	19,306,000	
Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars						
Salaries and expenses	8,878,000	10,070,000	5,140,000	6,537,000	5,840,000	-3,038,000
National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities						
National Endowment for the Arts						
Grants and administration	133,846,000	143,675,000	82,259,000	88,765,000	82,259,000	-51,587,000
Matching grants	28,512,000	28,725,000	17,235,000	21,235,000	17,235,000	-11,277,000
Total, National Endowment for the Arts	162,358,000	172,400,000	99,494,000	110,000,000	99,494,000	-62,864,000
National Endowment for the Humanities						
Grants and administration	146,131,000	156,087,000	82,469,000	94,000,000	94,000,000	-52,131,000
Matching grants	25,913,000	25,913,000	17,025,000	16,000,000	16,000,000	-9,913,000
Total, National Endowment for the Humanities	172,044,000	182,000,000	99,494,000	110,000,000	110,000,000	-62,044,000
Institute of Museum Services						
Grants and administration	28,715,000	29,800,000	21,000,000	21,000,000	21,000,000	-7,715,000
Total, National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities	363,117,000	384,200,000	219,988,000	241,000,000	230,494,000	-132,623,000
Commission of Fine Arts						
Salaries and expenses	834,000	879,000	834,000	834,000	834,000	
National Capital Arts and Cultural Affairs						
Grants	7,500,000	6,941,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	-1,500,000
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation						
Salaries and expenses	2,947,000	3,063,000	3,063,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	-447,000

FY 1996 INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 1977) — continued

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
National Capital Planning Commission						
Salaries and expenses	5,655,000	6,000,000	5,090,000	5,090,000	5,090,000	-565,000
Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission						
Salaries and expenses	48,000	147,000	48,000	147,000	147,000	+99,000
Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation						
Salaries and expenses	2,738,000	3,043,000	2,000,000			-2,738,000
Public development	4,084,000	2,445,000				-4,084,000
Land acquisition and development fund		1,388,000				
Total, Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation	6,822,000	6,876,000	2,000,000			-6,822,000
United States Holocaust Memorial Council						
Holocaust Memorial Council	26,609,000	28,707,000	28,707,000	26,609,000	28,707,000	+2,098,000
Total, title II, Related Agencies	7,011,333,000	6,961,469,000	5,997,212,000	6,107,062,000	6,141,431,000	-869,902,000
(Timber receipts transfer to general fund, indefinite)	(-44,769,000)	(-44,548,000)	(-44,548,000)	(-44,548,000)	(-44,548,000)	(+221,000)
(Timber purchaser credits)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	
TITLE III - GENERAL REDUCTION						
General reduction, Energy conservation			-12,799,000			
Grand total:						
New budget (obligational) authority (net)	13,519,230,000	13,817,404,000	11,984,603,000	12,053,099,000	12,164,636,000	-1,354,594,000
Appropriations	(13,549,230,000)	(13,832,204,000)	(12,027,402,000)	(12,083,099,000)	(12,194,636,000)	(-1,354,594,000)
Rescission	(-30,000,000)	(-30,000,000)	(-30,000,000)	(-30,000,000)	(-30,000,000)	
Crime trust fund		(15,200,000)				
(Timber receipts transfer to general fund, indefinite)	(-44,769,000)	(-44,548,000)	(-44,548,000)	(-44,548,000)	(-44,548,000)	(+221,000)
(Timber purchaser credits)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	
(By transfer)	(107,764,000)	(187,000,000)	(187,000,000)	(187,000,000)	(187,000,000)	(+79,236,000)
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR						
Bureau of Land Management	1,099,005,000	1,156,682,000	1,055,463,000	1,048,335,000	1,050,491,000	-48,514,000
United States Fish and Wildlife Service	671,038,000	702,817,000	568,938,000	603,850,000	603,864,000	-67,174,000
National Biological Service	162,041,000	172,696,000		145,965,000		-162,041,000
National Park Service	1,387,329,000	1,490,122,000	1,261,076,000	1,300,338,000	1,319,337,000	-67,992,000
United States Geological Survey	571,462,000	586,369,000	686,944,000	577,503,000	730,503,000	+159,041,000
Minerals Management Service	194,621,000	201,240,000	192,996,000	188,609,000	189,434,000	-5,187,000
Bureau of Mines	152,427,000	132,507,000	87,000,000	128,007,000	84,000,000	-68,427,000
Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement	293,407,000	292,773,000	269,578,000	266,411,000	269,857,000	-23,550,000
Bureau of Indian Affairs	1,730,970,000	1,897,941,000	1,682,808,000	1,459,912,000	1,571,412,000	-159,558,000
Territorial and International Affairs	121,575,000	94,170,000	81,923,000	93,126,000	90,126,000	-31,449,000
Departmental Offices	124,022,000	128,618,000	113,468,000	134,181,000	134,181,000	+10,159,000
Total, Title I - Department of the Interior	6,507,897,000	6,855,935,000	6,000,190,000	5,946,037,000	6,023,205,000	-484,692,000
TITLE II - RELATED AGENCIES						
Forest Service	2,803,602,000	2,416,539,000	2,103,671,000	2,176,224,000	2,166,579,000	-637,023,000
Department of Energy	1,265,887,000	1,416,775,000	1,154,586,000	1,143,589,000	1,179,411,000	-86,476,000
Indian Health Service	1,963,062,000	2,059,022,000	1,962,767,000	1,986,800,000	1,986,800,000	+23,738,000
Indian Education	81,341,000	84,785,000	52,500,000	54,660,000	52,500,000	-28,841,000
Office of Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation	24,888,000	26,345,000	21,345,000	20,345,000	20,345,000	-4,543,000
Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development	11,213,000	19,848,000	5,500,000	5,500,000	5,500,000	-5,713,000
Smithsonian Institution	362,706,000	407,450,000	350,375,000	372,892,000	373,092,000	+10,386,000
National Gallery of Art	56,916,000	64,451,000	56,815,000	59,229,000	58,288,000	+1,368,000
John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts	19,308,000	19,373,000	18,783,000	19,308,000	19,308,000	
Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars	8,876,000	10,070,000	5,140,000	6,537,000	5,840,000	-3,036,000
National Endowment for the Arts	162,358,000	172,400,000	99,494,000	110,000,000	99,494,000	-62,864,000
National Endowment for the Humanities	172,044,000	182,000,000	99,494,000	110,000,000	110,000,000	-62,044,000
Institute of Museum Services	28,715,000	29,800,000	21,000,000	21,000,000	21,000,000	-7,715,000
Commission of Fine Arts	834,000	879,000	834,000	834,000	834,000	
National Capital Arts and Cultural Affairs	7,500,000	6,941,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	-1,500,000
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation	2,947,000	3,063,000	3,063,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	-447,000
National Capital Planning Commission	5,655,000	6,000,000	5,090,000	5,090,000	5,090,000	-565,000
Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission	48,000	147,000	48,000	147,000	147,000	+99,000
Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation	6,822,000	6,876,000	2,000,000			-6,822,000
Holocaust Memorial Council	26,609,000	28,707,000	28,707,000	26,609,000	28,707,000	+2,098,000
Total, Title II - Related Agencies	7,011,333,000	6,961,469,000	5,997,212,000	6,107,062,000	6,141,431,000	-869,902,000
TITLE III - GENERAL REDUCTION						
General reduction, Energy conservation			-12,799,000			
Grand total	13,519,230,000	13,817,404,000	11,984,603,000	12,053,099,000	12,164,636,000	-1,354,594,000

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

My good friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA], has done as good a job as one can do with the assets that were at hand, a reasonable job, but it still is a very, very bad bill, and I intend to vote against it. He said that the conferees had responded to the motions of the House by making appropriate changes to Tongass and mining. The mining change does restore the moratorium, but the change to Tongass is so small as to be infinitesimal, and it still will be environmentally unsound.

Mr. Speaker, the song asks where have all the flowers gone, and the poem asks where are the snows of yesteryear. I ask where are all the Republican moderates going? Will the Republicans reject a bill that is as environmentally disgraceful as the previous bill? It appears that the Republican leadership has pressured their moderate members to swallow hard and support this bill, and that is too bad because this bill is not worthy of their support, nor is it worthy of the support of any of us in the House.

□ 1430

The conference report before us still puts our precious natural resources at grave risk. This conference report mandates the Forest Service implement the discredited alternative P management plan in the Tongass National Forest in Alaska, and this bad plan is not forced upon the Forest Service for 1 year, but it mandates alternative P be employed as well in fiscal year 1997.

I think most Members now know that alternative P is a radical forest management plan that was rejected by the Forest Service and rejected by the Governor of Alaska because it would wreak ecological havoc on the Tongass. Currently the Forest Service allows 310 million board feet of timber to be cut from the Tongass each year. Alternative P does not recognize that limitation, although my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio, indicated that the funds that are made available for the cut in this year will only allow a cut of 310 million board feet. Nevertheless, the spurs will be put to the Forest Service, the whip will be lashed upon its employees to exceed the 310 million board feet, because alternative P puts that pressure upon them.

In addition, the Tongass provisions are fiscally irresponsible. The Tongass is a notorious below-cost forest. In the last 3 years the Government lost $102 million in timber sales there. If the timber harvest increases, the loss to the taxpayers increases. It will go up dramatically. What is more, this conference report also contains sufficiency language concerning which my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio, spoke. It is aimed at overturning the 9th Circuit Court ruling that blocks the sale of 280 million board feet of timber. If this sufficiency language is approved, no environmental laws will be in effect for the large sale, the large sale for which the sufficiency language is placed in the bill.

That means, Mr. Speaker, the Endangered Species Act is dismissed, the National Environmental Policy Act is waived, the Clean Water Act is ignored, and all other applicable laws are considered irrelevant. In addition, this sufficiency language prevents all citizens, environmentalists and private landowners alike, from exercising their right for a fair hearing before the courts.

If we do not recommit this conference report, we will be rejecting the judgment of the Forest Service. We will be putting a great forest at risk, and we will be setting a dangerous legal precedent.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to offer a motion to recommit at the appropriate time, and I hope that motion may be sustained, with the help of the moderate Republicans, again.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes and 30 seconds to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE], a member of the subcommittee.

(Mr. KOLBE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Interior appropriations conference report. This $12.1 billion appropriations bill is the result of a lot of hard work, and yes, a lot of compromise. As we know, this bill has been recommitted twice because of concerns that have been expressed regarding two of the provisions that have already been mentioned here today, the mining patent moratorium and statutory language regarding the Tongass National Forest. But those two issues have been resolved after a lot of tough negotiations. Now it is time we pass this important legislation and send it to the President.

Putting together a workable budget for the Department of the Interior, the Department of Energy, the Forest Service, and numerous other independent agencies under this subcommittee's jurisdiction has not been an easy one. There have been a lot of roadblocks. Some of them have been legitimate, some of them frivolous. But here we are with a conference report that is fair, it is fiscally conservative, and I think it represents an excellent starting point for the 7-year journey toward a balanced budget that both the Congress and the President have now committed themselves to doing.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA], chairman of the committee, has informed us of the various provisions that are in this bill. I just want to reemphasize a couple of them. We have attempted to place an emphasis on preserving natural and cultural resources, the maintenance of scientific and research functions, our commitment to the health and educational needs of Native Americans. The conference report also ensures that adequate resources are allocated for our Nation's public parks and, our crown jewels, our National Park System. In fact, in an era of decreasing budgets, this bill actually contains an increase in the operational account of the National Park Service. This is going to prove invaluable to the management of America's parks. Contrary to some published reports, the subcommittee never, never considered or even contemplated closing any of our Nation's parks.

I have spoken previously about some of the projects and programs in this report. A couple, though, deserve to be highlighted again. An important and much needed initiative is the recreational fee demonstration program. This innovative program will give the National Park Service, the Bureau of Land Management, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the Forest Service, the opportunity to establish a 1-year pilot program that allows these land management agencies to charge and utilize onsite recreational use and access fees. The conference report directs each agency to establish up to 50 demonstration sites where broad fee authorities are established.

The best aspect of this program is that the bulk of the fees that are collected stay at the site which collects them. Allowing 80 percent of the fees that are collected to be used in that particular park is a way to give park managers an incentive to collect fees and make visitor driven improvements.

Another important aspect of this conference report is the level of funding for the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Is it as much as the House initially provided? No. Compromises did have to be made. I think the level of funding proposed in this report is fair and it goes a long way to providing the necessary infrastructure services our tribal communities depend upon.

Under this bill, the BIA will receive $1.3 billion in fiscal year 1996. This represents an additional $25 million we added during the third conference for the tribal priority allocation program. It will now have $653 million in fiscal year 1996. That is $111 million above what the Senate had proposed. Conferees also added another $25 million to the Indian Health Service Account, bringing their 1996 funding level to $1.747 billion.

In addition to the preceding, the conference report contains a provision which is vitally important to the astrophysical community and certainly to the State of Arizona. This provision will allow the Mt. Graham Observatory project to continue construction of the world's largest ground-based telescope, the large binocular telescope. This legislative clarification was needed because of constant and often frivolous lawsuits that have beset the project, even though Congress spoke clearly on

this matter when it passed the Arizona-Idaho Wilderness Act in 1988, authorizing the construction of these three telescopes.

I want to thank the chairman of the committee, Senator GORTON, and all my colleagues on the conference committee for supporting this effort. Mr. Speaker, the conference report provides a sound and fiscally conservative blueprint for the continued management of our public lands. As stewards of these lands, it is incumbent upon us to ensure that they are preserved for future generations to enjoy. Let us stop the demagoguing and political posturing. It is a good bill, it is one that merits our support. Let us send it to the President. Support this conference report and let us defeat any motion to recommit.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS], a member of our subcommittee.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, as we begin debate on this conference report, the third time we have had a conference report on this measure, I want to join my other colleagues in both paying my respect and expressing my affection toward our chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA], even as I express my dislike for his bill. I suspect that perhaps the chairman would rather have affection for his bill, rather than for him. But be that as it may, we are back again for the third time on this particular measure, and the Republican leadership's third try for an acceptable conference report on this important appropriations bill.

The first two times this bill was brought to the floor, the House did the right thing. We rejected the conference report and told the conferees to go back and try again. It was the right thing to do because neither of those conference reports deserved to pass.

This version is not quite so bad, but it still falls short, in my opinion, and I cannot support it. The Republican leadership would not let the conferees even try to improve many of the funding provisions in the previous conference report. While this version does provide somewhat more funding for native American programs, which I endorse heartily, the other provisions remain unchanged. The report still has all of the previous version's antienvironmental riders, like the ban on any new listings under the Endangered Species Act.

The report does a much better job dealing with a moratorium on bargain basement sales of mineral lands. But as the ranking member, the gentleman from Illinois, has already pointed out, what about Tongass? The previous report called for increased timbering, including in areas that the Forest Service wants to put off limits in order to protect fish and wildlife, and would make permanent some of the temporary restrictions on protecting habitat that were misguidedly included in the rescissions bill earlier this year. This conference report with respect to Tongass is almost as bad, and on this point alone, if for no other reason, we should send it back so we may try again.

Regarding the National Endowment for the Arts, the conferees voted again to retain the so-called Helms language. That is a sad decision, and it should not be accepted.

In short, Mr. Speaker, this third conference report still is a bad bill, still deserves to be defeated. We should not pass it. If we do, the President should veto it and we should sustain that veto.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG], chairman of the Committee on Resources.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I would ask, where are the timber jobs of yesteryear? We asked where the flowers were and where the moderate Republicans are, but where are the timber jobs of yesteryear? The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] had the privilege of serving at one time as the chairman, and knows full good and well, he voted for the Tongass agreement to allow us, in fact, to have a sound economy, yet leaving over 15 million acres in southeast Alaska out of the mutiple-use timber base.

Good fiction never dies, especially fiction about the Tongass Forest that is being spread on this floor today. I can hardly believe my ears. Such a distinguished gentleman saying this would destroy the last standing rain forest of the great southeast Alaska, when there are 15 million acres already off limits to logging, and he has twice voted in this Congress to do so.

But we have lost 42 percent of our timber workers since the last act of this Congress on the Tongass in 1990.

This bill, as I suggested to the conference and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA], is not everything I would want. In fact, this Tongass issue is truly a red herring. All we are asking in this agreement is to freeze a land base of 1.7 million acres, the amount of land agreed to in 1990 that would be available for timber over a 100-year period. The amendment says that the land base can no longer be taken away. And remember, we have 15 million acres of land available for wildlife and old growth habitat today. We are talking about a very small, tiny land base for timber.

Harvesting does not change, in fact, what can be harvested, does not increase at all under the provision. It does not tell the Forest Service what they can do, other than the fact it says ''You can no longer take away any of that land base that we made available in two previous acts of Congress.''

This, in fact, is further than I would have gone, but my senior Senator in fact has agreed to this. He sits on the conference. I am going to suggest, this conference report must pass.

I listened to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] yesterday saying ''We can solve these problems if we just send the appropriation bills to the President.'' We are going to do that today. We will send him a bill that should be signed, a bill that does take care of the problem, a bill, in fact, that does keep a moratorium on mining, which the gentleman wishes to do. That is what he wanted.

This is good legislation, but I again would like to put to rest this constant misinformation, this constant fiction about the Tongass National Forest. We are talking about 1.7 million acres available for harvest but not cut, and we are talking about 15 million acres of rain forest unavailable for logging, 15 million acres for the future generations to study those great old trees and watch them become gray and fall down. We have already done that. Let us vote for this conference report. This is good legislation. Let us support the chairman.

□ 1445

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER].

(Ms. SLAUGHTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in opposition to H.R. 1977, the Department of Interior appropriations for fiscal year 1996. As my colleagues all know, this is now the third time the House has considered this measure. Twice before, we sent it back to conferees and demanded that they place a moratorium on the sale of Federal lands for as little as $2.50 an acre. Today, we have a third try at the Interior conference report which could stop this giveaway temporarily, but still contains some dangerous provisions.

When I look at the conference provisions to eliminate the Bureau of Mines, I am dismayed that Congress is rushing to dismantle the agency. As a child in Harlan County, KY, I was aware of mine disasters regularly occurring with great loss of life. Mining is considered the most dangerous of jobs. It took President Franklin Roosevelt to care enough about working people to intervene and impose worker safety standards.

Now, deciding that businesses know better, the 104th Congress has already crippled worker safety programs in the Labor Department. Under this legislation today, we will approve eliminating the Bureau of Mines, and accept a vague promise that health and safety research will be transferred to the Energy Department; itself slated to be demolished.

Another grave mistake in this conference report is the destruction of the NEA. When I see provisions to slash funding for the arts, I cannot understand the sense of this Congress to phase out an agency which costs about 64 cents a year per taxpayer and yields $3.4 billion a year in tax revenue. I urge my colleagues to realize how much economic growth results from a modest investment in the arts.

Just last week, an article in the New York Times described the annual storytelling festival held in Jonesborough, TN, which drew crowds from all 50 States and generated over $5 million in economic activity.

All across the country, cities and convention centers are forming partnerships with arts councils and museums, realizing the revenue possibilities with increased tourism.

In October, the White House Conference on Travel and Tourism devoted a day long session to cultural tourism, and the conference overwhelmingly agreed that arts and museum attractions were vital to any city's competition for tourists.

Besides the economic reasons to support the arts, we have to realize the arts' impact on our children's education. In a recent survey of public elementary and secondary schools conducted by the Department of Education, teachers and administrators viewed the arts, music, and creative writing as essential to a child's education. If we vote today to approve these cuts to the NEA, the educational and economic impact to our cities would be greater than we could ever imagine.

Mr. Speaker, a vote for the Interior appropriations bill sends a message that we approve of clearcutting and logging; that we accept rolling back protection for mine workers; and that we feel secure sacrificing Federal support for our Nation's cultural programs. Vote against this bill.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT].

(Mr. BOEHLERT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this conference report. We did not get it right the first two times. We have made some significant improvements this time.

Once again I want to extend my appreciation to Chairman REGULA, who did truly Herculean work in brokering this compromise. For weeks he engaged in a sort of shuttle diplomacy that would put Henry Kissinger to shame. He has my deepest appreciation.

We have heard a lot about the moratorium on the mining. That is a plus, because that moratorium is in this legislation. And I believe the language on the Tongass National Forest in this bill is a reasonable compromise. Certainly I would prefer that the bill have no Tongass provision at all, but I believe we needed to reach an agreement to move this appropriation forward, and it is a fair compromise.

The compromise removes the sufficiency language that would have insulated alternative P from legal challenges. That is an important victory for the environment.

The compromise removes the prohibition against setting up habitat conservation areas. That is an important victory for the environment.

The compromise removes the constraints on future planting in the Tongass, allowing science to determine the content of future forest management plans. That, too, is an important victory for the environment.

These are all important advances that will protect the forest from excessive logging and permit science to be the basis for future planning.

I want to emphasize that nothing in this bill in any way limits the ability of the Forest Service to make decisions about the future of the Tongass, including reducing the timber acreage or timber sale quantity. Science, that means peer review science conducted in line with standard scientific procedures. Science will determine those figures.

The managers' language makes clear that the Forest Service is empowered to continue with its planning, including filing a final environmental impact statement and record of decision.

The only limitation is that no revisions can be implemented before September 30, 1997. So this is a reasonable compromise.

And my good colleague and friend from Illinois with whom I worked closely on this issue has asked, where have the moderates gone? The moderates have gone into the conference room to sit down with all the players to work out something that makes sense, that protects the environment and gets us the progress we want. Those who oppose this conference report should consider the alternative, and that alternative is not very friendly to anyone, most likely a continuing resolution with lower funding and more restrictions. We do not want that.

I urge my colleagues to support this conference report, and I thank the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA], the chairman, He deserves our praise.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, this is one of the clearest cut, so to speak, examples of corporate welfare that we see padded in our Federal budget.

What we have here is plain and simple, a recognition that while this bill goes about cutting a program to provide low-income people and moderate-income people weatherization funds which are cut by 47 percent, in the same bill we go back in and provide subsidies to the biggest lumber companies in this country, of hundreds of millions of dollars to go in so that they can cut down virgin trees in our most pristine areas of our national forests.

We use Forest Service employees to go in and identify trees, that then the big companies come in cut the trees down, take the trees over to Japan, they mulch them up into fiberboard, we bring them back, buy them in the United States, build our homes with Japanese-supported improvements on our own trees, and then what we do is send the bill to the American taxpayer.

We sit here on the House floor and watch time and time again while the Republican Party stands up and condemns black women on welfare, and yet when it comes to corporate welfare, all of a sudden they lose their tongues.

It is time for this country to come to grips with where the money goes in the Federal budget, whether or not we are willing to stand up to those that have and want more, or whether or not we want to provide a meager opportunity to those that are struggling to put their house in order and to try to be part of the American dream.

I think that this bill demonstrates when we start throwing hundreds of millions of dollars at the Tongass, the Tongass, the most pristine and most beautiful place that I have ever been in the United States of America, and we are extending the amount of land that the Tongass has to be allowed to be cut down by our lumber companies by a third in this bill.

Why would we possibly destroy America's forests and not come to grips with the cost to the American taxpayer?

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], a member of the full committee.

(Mr. LEWIS of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I very much appreciate my colleague yielding me the time.

I want to say to Chairman REGULA and his subcommittee members and staff that I know it has been a very difficult process finally putting this conference report together. I think the kind of work that has been done by our chairman in connection with making compromises can best be illustrated by pointing to a very serious problems that relates to the work that is being done in the California desert.

As all of your know, the last Congress, we spent many hours on this floor debating the future of the California desert. No small part of that debate centered around the fact that some of us were concerned that the Park Service was being asked to become the new managers of a region that they had very little experience in managing. The Park Service by statute is a single use agency. The desert, however, is unique area that for generations has a long and successful history of multiple use management.

I was very much concerned about the National Park Service's ability to handle these responsibilities. Indeed, we have learned in recent months that they need a good deal more preparation for that management.

Let me share with my colleagues an unfortunate problem that developed recently. The Park Service, in classic form, decided to run their new responsibilities at the Mojave Preserve in a single purpose fashion. In doing so, they essentially excluded many volunteer wildlife organizations that had been very helpful in managing the California desert. The California Department of Fish and Game was excluded as were volunteers from the Society for the Conservation of Bighorn Sheep. These volunteers have worked for years to build a fantastic success story in dealing with the bighorn sheep. Unfortunately, the Park Service excluded them from the Mojave Preserve. As a direct result of Park Service mismanagement, water guzzlers that were voluntarily developed in conjunction with the Bureau of Land Management and the California Department of Fish and Game to help build up our bighorn sheep population malfunctioned. As a result of restricted access by the Park Service, 38 bighorn sheep were killed.

What that really means is our efforts to build that herd up to some 2,000 animals by the year 2000 probably has been undermined because of frankly a lack of experience on managing a multipurpose area.

There is absolutely no doubt that this bill begins to meet that challenge by directing the Park Service to rethink where they have been, come forward with a management plan that will recognize the traditional multiple uses of the Mojave region so that we can save the wildlife success stories that we have had in the eastern Mojave Desert.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, this bill started out terrible and it is slowly getting better. I think maybe the third time is the charm, although I still do not support it because I still believe it is a bad bill that undercuts essential American efforts, it is still environmentally unsound, although incrementally getting better thanks to the efforts of Democrats, being joined by a few moderate Republicans.

However, this bill still savages the National Endowment for the Humanities and the National Endowment for the Arts and still contains language that on its own merit, the Helms language, would not pass even this Congress because it is unconstitutional. But the bill is getting better.

I want to commend both sides for adding funds for Native Americans. Frankly the Democrats embarrassed the Republicans into putting this additional money in here and even though it is not enough, it improves the bill.

I want to take a moment now, however, to mention a matter of great importance to my constituents in Montana and also other Americans. The Senate is going to place in the report, Senate committee report, language which, although it does not have the force of law, is very disturbing. The Senate report language represents an attempt to discourage the efforts of our Secretary of Agriculture to protect the best wild places left in the northern Rocky Mountains in Montana.

Secretary Glickman, a number of weeks ago, announced his intention to issue a directive which will protect the wildest remaining roadless lands in Montana. Those are lands, by the way, which just a year and some ago this House voted overwhelmingly to place in wilderness.

In the last session of Congress, the House voted to place 1.7 million acres of Montana's wildest remaining roadless lands in wilderness. Secretary Glickman is determined, on behalf of President Clinton, to follow the intention of that Congress in which 308 members voted to provide ultimate protection to those wild lands.

Those lands are now under threat. They are under threat from oil and gas leasing, they are under threat from green harvest, most particularly under threat from the salvage sale because of the bill that was supported, sadly, by a majority in this House and Senate.

□ 1500

Those areas are now under threat of being roaded, blasted and gouged. Secretary Glickman has announced his intention to issue an order protecting those areas under his discretion as Secretary of Agriculture until finally both the House and Senate can move, as the House did, alone, in the last Congress.

The Senate report language, in effect, asks the Secretary of Agriculture not to do that, asks that development go ahead in this the last best place of America.

I simply want the RECORD to show that in the last Congress by a vote of almost 3 to 1. This House voted that those areas receive the ultimate protection of wilderness and I am convinced that this Congress might do no less if it had the opportunity.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RAHALL].

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, as the old saying goes,three times is a charm.

This is the third time this body is considering the conference report on the fiscal year 1996 Interior appropriation.

And, by golly, this time they have finally got it right, at least, as right as they'll ever get it in terms of maintaining the moratorium on the issuance of mining claim patents.

This version of the conference agreement basically extends the moratorium on the Interior Department issuing mining claim patents that was in place during fiscal year 1995.

In recognition that some patent applications are far enough along the process where the right to a patent may have vested, as with the fiscal year 1995 moratorium, the pending language grandfathers those claims.

While I would prefer to see no patents issued, I cannot quarrel with this grandfather provision as it is aimed at protecting the taxpayer from expensive takings claims.

I also would prefer not to see language in the moratorium requiring an expedited processing of the grandfathered claims. Frankly, the deadline set in the legislation will be impossible for the Department to meet so I do not place a great deal of weight on it.

I am going to support this conference agreement. I am not enthused about the Tongass provision or the Mount Graham telescope language.

I strongly support the designation of Yellowstone National Park as a world heritage site in danger, and note that the conferees simply wrote report language against this proposal. This report language does not carry the weight of law.

And finally, if I had my preference, the appropriations for the Office of Surface Mining and the National Park Service would be a lot different than what is contained in this bill.

However, in light of the fact that the conferees have finally addressed the important issue of mining claim patents in a suitable fashion, and that we must provide funding for the many important programs within the Interior Department, I intend to support this conference agreement although not the bill I would have written, but then rarely is a bill so written.

Mr. Speaker, I do strongly commend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA], the subcommittee chairman, as well as the ranking member, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], for their years and years of dedicated effort to

try to enact true mining law reform, and absent that we have had to go along with this moratorium as it exists, and as it exists in this particular bill, I will support it.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself this time to bring to the attention of the House the letter I have just received from the Executive Office of the President, OMB, dated December 13, 1995, relating to H.R. 1977, the Department of Interior and related agencies appropriations bill, and I quote:

This statement of administration policy provides the administration's views on H.R. 1977, the Department of the Interior and related agencies appropriations bill, FY 1996, as approved in conference December 12, 1995.

In the November 6, 1995, statement of administration policy to the House, the administration identified the most troublesome provisions in the original conference report with the goal of arriving at a bill that serves specific vital interests and that could be signed by the President.

Regrettably, the third conference report does not adequately address the significant funding shortfalls and objectionable legislative riders. If the bill, as approved by the third conference, were it presented to the President, he would veto it. With few exceptions, the issues that were identified in the November 6 statement of administration policy remain serious problems and are described below.

And there are three pages of objections.

Mr. Speaker, I am including the full statement of administration policy as a part of the RECORD at this point.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET,
Washington, DC, December 13, 1995.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

(This statement has been coordinated by OMB with the concerned agencies.)

H.R. 1977—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, FY 1996

Sponsors: Livingston (R) Louisiana; Regula (R) (Ohio).

This Statement of Administration Policy provides the Administration's views on H.R. 1977, the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, FY 1996, as approved in conference on December 12, 1995. Your consideration of the Administration's views would be appreciated.

In the November 6, 1995, Statement of Administration Policy to the House, the Administration identified the most troublesome provisions in the original conference report with the goal of arriving at a bill that serves specific, vital interests and that could be signed by the President.

Regrettably, the third conference report does not adequately address the significant funding shortfalls and objectionable legislative riders. If the bill, as approved by the third conference, were presented to the President, he would veto it. With few exceptions, the issues that were identified in the November 6th Statement of Administration Policy remain serious problems and are described below.

Funding Issues

While the Administration appreciates the $50 million in funding restored for the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Indian Health Service, this additional funding falls short of the levels needed to maintain these important programs. In addition, the third conference has done nothing to restore funds for the Department of Energy's (DOE's) energy conservation programs.

The Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) budget has been increased in the third conference $25 million above the previous conference level. That would still leave the program $111 million short of the House mark and $159 million below the FY 1995 enacted level. The most significant effect of this action remains the crippling reductions targeted at tribal priority allocation programs, which support essential tribal government, law enforcement, housing improvement, general assistance, Indian child welfare, adult vocational training, road maintenance, and other basic reservation services. The Administration's view is that funding must be restored more substantially for these programs.

DOE's energy conservation programs are still funded at a net level of $536 million. There has been no increase from the first or second conference levels. This funding level is $187 million, or 26 percent, below the net FY 1995 enacted level of $723 million, and 38 percent below the President's request. Funding for these programs must be restored significantly in order to reach acceptable levels.

In addition to the satisfactory resolution of the language issues addressed below, the President will not sign an Interior appropriations bill unless funding for these programs is significantly restored without harming in other high-priority programs or unless there is an overall agreement between the Congress and the Administration on budget priorities that addresses the Administration's fundamental concerns about spending priorities both in this bill and elsewhere.

Language Issues

The conference committee has made few changes to the numerous legislative riders in the bill that the Administration finds seriously objectionable. Except for the continuation of the existing mining patent moratorium, the riders that were cited in the November 6th Statement of Administration Policy has not been significantly improved in the third conference. These provisions are so seriously flawed that the Administration sees no way to remedy them, short of removing them altogether. The most serious problems are:

The Tongass (Alaska) forest management provisions. These provisions would dictate the use of the current forest plan for FY 1996 and FY 1997, require unsustainable timber sale levels, and not allow the plan to be updated during this period;

The Interior Columbia River Basin provision. This provision would continue to impede implementation of the comprehensive plan for management of public lands by prohibiting the publication of the final Environmental Impact Statement or Record of Decision and limiting the contents to exclude information on fisheries and watersheds, although it would extend by 90 days the due date for the assessment project. The provision would risk a return to legal gridlock on timber harvesting, grazing, mining, and other economically desirable activities;

Bill language that provides $500,000 from available funds for the National Park Service (NPS) to develop the Mojave National Preserve's management plan. This provision would still limit funding to $1 for NPS land management operations within the Preserve, while providing $599,000 for operational funding to be managed by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM). Report language adopted by the third conference calling for more studies by the Park Service, and prohibiting any transfer of funds to NPS to augment operations, does not change the fact that the Preserve would be starved of funding, and the purposes of the California Desert Act would be undercut; and

No change in language from the first conference in a rider to make permanent the protocol for identification of marbled murrelet nests that was included in the FY 1995 rescission bill, thereby eliminating normal flexibility to use new scientific information as it develops.

In addition, the Administration has previously expressed concern about other legislative riders, including the moratorium of future listings and critical habitat designations under the Endangered Species Act, the Department of Energy efficiency standards one-year moratorium, and the provision affecting the Lummi Tribe and seven other self-governance tribes in Washington State.

An additional funding issue concerns the severe cuts (nearly 40 percent) to the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) and the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH). These significantly reduced funding levels would jeopardize NEA's and NEH's ability to continue to provide important cultural, educational, and artistic programs for communities across America.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

(Mr. VENTO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this Interior appropriation bill. Unfortunately, what has occurred here as we have marched through 3 months of off and on floor consideration of this Interior appropriation is that the House has on two occasions, on one occasion by over a 2-to-1 vote, sent this back to conference because of the mining patent problems, has sent it back to conference because of the Tongass language, and not only has the conference not dealt effectively with those issues, they have made some cosmetic changes in terms of them, but the substance and thrust of them, the effect that they would have in terms of the policy initiatives, remains intact, that it is and remains intact in terms of its micromanagement and, of course, according to the mineral rights and patents of the various claims that were filed before 1994. The effect is to make the effect of having a moratorium on mining patients null and void in this insofar as anything that occurred before September 30, 1994. That is probably the ball game. That is the ball game in terms of what is going on.

In the Tongass, the national forest bill modified the language but the levels of timber, 418 million board feet out of the Tongass, is exactly what the language was before. It may be modified in some respects, but it has the same effect.

Worst than that, Mr. Speaker, it seems like this measure has become a moving target, this particular legislation, and I lament that it has become a moving target to attach any legislative matters that the Republican majority thinks that they need to get done, they do not want to have considered or voted on the floor in an up-or-down vote and debated in an open way.

We have maintained log exports from the Northwest, regulations limiting log exports from the Pacific Northwest is set aside. There is authorizing law; a designation of the Vancouver national historic site, an issue that is being and should be considered in the resources authorizing committee. It has changes in the Columbia River Basin assessment. It has new National Park Service authorities. It has managers language in terms of what the park service may do with regard to the protection of Yellowstone, one of the crown jewels of the National Park System in terms of how we can protect the areas around it because there is development in terms of goldmining and that is going to affect the watersheds and this national park. This legislation bars protection or action to monitor.

And so apparently that is of paramount concern to the new majority to protect that degradation of Yellowstone National Park in this legislation.

It talks about wilderness designation and limiting such designation to law. I always thought we legislated wilderness designation. Apparently, at best this measure is the redundant reiteration of the self-evident with regard to what we do with wilderness designation, but I do not know what the language does, or its purpose.

Far more, it goes on to keep all the other riders and limitations preventing the Secretary to exercise his stewardship responsibilities with regard to grazing, preventing the Secretary from trying to attain the recordation of roads and the degradation of the environment.

This bill deserves to be defeated once more today because it has grown worse, not better, in the bad faith effort on the part of the Republican majority party. Today they point to the date and the pressure to enact funding for the departments and agencies in this measure, but the basis for not acting to pass this measure in October or November have not changed. The mining provisions have not changed, the Tongass timber language retains all the limits on the ability to reasonably regulate grazing, road rights of ways and the Endanged Species Act persist in this measure and to add insult to injury the measure piles on new riders and limits—it was not right in September, October, or November and even this crock of December does not justify and warrant passing an appropriation that has grown worst with age not better.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], the distinguished chairman of the full committee.

(Mr. LIVINGSTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend, the gentleman from Ohio, for his incredible patience in working this bill through. This is the third time we have tried to get this through the House, and as the gentleman who preceded me in the well has vigorously pointed out, some people are never going to be satisfied with this bill. He is not, and there will be others who will vote against it.

But we have massaged this bill under the leadership of the gentleman from Ohio. He has worked with the environmentalists. He has worked with the people in the West who are concerned about mining. He has worked with the people in Alaska who are concerned about the Tongass and the environmentalists who are concerned about the same issue on the other side. We have worked with people concerned about the Mohave Desert, and one issue after another, and we have brought them together in the spirit of compromise. That is the legislative process.

The Senate and the House have come together, Republicans and Democrats have come together to agree. Liberals and conservatives, environmentalists and other people who may not consider themselves quite within the environmental mode, all of these people have come together, and today is the day.

The bill did not pass the first time, because one group or another was unhappy. The bill did not pass the second time because other people were unhappy. Today, for crying out loud, let us pass this bill. Send it to the Senate and send it to the President for his signature, yes, for his signature. I know he is threatening a veto, as the gentleman from Illinois has pointed out, but he threatened a veto on the defense bill, too, and he ended up letting that become law.

This is as good a bill as we can get. We have got all the interests competing. We have worked, we have massaged, and we have tried to mold this bill and satisfy everyone's concerns. It is a reasonable bill. It is a good bill. The President of the United States should sign it into law.

I urge the adoption of this conference report.

Mr. Speaker, earlier the technical 602(b) violation was discussed. I just want to make clear the committee is well within its overall 602 allocation. This particular subcommittee's subdivision however is in technical violation of the so-called 602(b) at this time. The committee has not had an opportunity to revise its latest allocation to shift the necessary funds into the Interior subcommittee. In order to make this new conference report comply with the allocation we will have to shift some $22 million in budget authority and some $36 million in outlays. Even with this shift in funds the committee's domestic allocation would still be some $2.1 billion in budget authority below the ceiling and some $570 million in outlays below the ceilings.

The committee has always stayed within its overall allocation, and will redirect the funds accordingly.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, Members, my colleagues, this is a good bill. We have addressed your concerns. You have heard the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT] speak and the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG] who had some differences on the Tongass and on mining, and they both agreed that this represents a reasonable compromise, as was clearly pointed out by the chairman.

I would just point out, also, that in terms of the Tongass, we have reduced the cut from 450 million board feet to 418 and as a practical matter, it will be about 310.

Likewise, we have addressed the mining concerns. The issues that were in the recommittals, I think, have been very thoroughly addressed, and this is quite evident by the fact that the people who have an interest on both sides have spoken in favor of this bill.

Also, I would address the question the President raises in his message about not enough money is being spent. Well, obviously earlier we heard that it was a budget buster. Now, I think that message is a bit in conflict. The truth of the matter is it is a responsible bill, and it does reduce spending, but it uses the funds available in a very prudent way.

As far as the Bureau of Indian Affairs, we have addressed the needs of education, of health. We are actually above the President's request in one of his last statements.

Overall I think that we have a very good bill. I think it is important we get this down to the White House, and I hope that they would sign this so that the 130,000 people that serve all of us in the parks and forests can get on with the job and serve the American people in the way that they would like.

Let me strongly urge the members on both sides to reject the recommittal motion which will be again on the Tongass. We have already, as you have heard from other speakers, we have addressed the problems in the Tongass. Let us reject the recommittal motion and pass the bill.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, once again, I cannot support this Interior appropriations conference agreement, It is a bad deal. Not only are the mining provisions a sham, but once again the bill is a back door attempt to repeal the California Desert Protection Act.

In addition to retaining the $1 limit on the Park Service budget to manage the Mojave Preserve, this version goes even further by capping their planning money as well. While this third attempt provides a nominal increase to $500,000 in planning money, it does nothing to restore the protections needed to ensure the park is properly maintained.

When Congress passed the California Desert Protection Act, it placed much of California's desert wilderness under the jurisdiction of the National Park Service. This provided much greater environmental protection than previously afforded under the Bureau of Land Management.

Last year the National Park Service improved visitor services, resource protection, and law enforcement in the Mojave resulting in significantly increased visitation and revenues for the surrounding communities. During the 14 years that the BLM managed the Mojave as a national scenic area, open pit mining,

motorcycle races, and general environmental degradation led to widespread protest.

I understand my good friend and colleague Mr. LEWIS' concern that the Park Service not become overzealous in its oversight of the preserve. However, even the local chamber of commerce has conceded that the new management of the park has enhanced tourism and made the Mojave more enjoyable for everyone. They endorse the changes made by the California Desert Protection Act and oppose the language in this appropriations measure. Not only is the BLM funding level for the preserve inadequate in this measure—a mere $600,000—but the Park Service's ability to devise a plan to manage the preserve in the future is severely restricted both in dollars and in time. Unless a plan is devised in the next few months, management of the Mojave will in all probability stay in BLM clutches.

I urge my colleagues to once again send the message on this measure that major policy changes affecting the environment—regarding both mining and the Mojave—should be conducted through an open and deliberative legislative process, not shortcutted through the appropriations bills. Vote ''no'' on the Interior appropriations conference report.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the conference report on Interior and related agencies appropriations.

There are a number of reasons to oppose this ill-conceived legislation, and I have discussed some of them in previous debates on this bill. Today, I would like to focus on one shortcoming that is particularly disturbing about the legislation, and that is its failure to provide adequate funding for energy efficiency programs at the Energy Department.

DOE's efficiency programs support the development of new energy efficient technologies that prevent pollution, create jobs, make our economy more competitive, and save consumers precious dollars. Unfortunately, the Republican majority has elected to slash funding for our energy efficiency efforts by 28 percent from the fiscal year 1995 enacted budget.

Of particular concern is the nearly 50 percent cut in low-income weatherization assistance. This program leverages over $100 million dollars in outside money, enabling low-income Americans to better handle winter and summer energy costs. Because of these debilitating cuts, many thousand fewer homes will become energy efficient this year.

President Clinton has vowed to veto the fiscal year 1996 Interior appropriations bill if and when a conference report clears the Congress. A recent statement of administration policy on the Interior bill stated that, ''Funding for [energy efficiency] programs must be restored significantly in order to reach acceptable levels.'' I strongly encourage the President to stand firm on his commitment to energy efficiency as a solution which protects the environment and helps the economy.

The President is quite right to criticize this legislation for failing to adequately fund the energy conservation programs within the DOE. The level of funding in H.R. 1977 is inadequate to carry on the important work of these programs.

Many House Members continue to support the President's position on this matter. I urge defeat of the conference report and request that the attached letter to the President, which was signed by 68 House Members, be included in the RECORD.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, December 6, 1995.

Re H.R. 1977—energy conservation programs

Hon. WILLIAM J. CLINTON,
The President, The White House

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We want to take this opportunity to strongly endorse the Statements of Administration Policy of November 7, 1995 and October 19, 1995, in which you indicated that the Department of Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill for Fiscal Year 1996 (H.R. 1977) should and would be vetoed for a variety of reasons. We share your concern that this legislation does not adequately fund the energy conservation programs within the Department of Energy (DOE).

The funding level for these programs of $553 million is identical to the first conference report funding level and remains $215 million (or 28 percent) below fiscal year 1995 appropriations and 38 percent below your budget request.

We believe that this level of funding is inadequate to carry on the important work of these programs. As you know, DOE's energy conservation programs help every American by saving consumers precious dollars, making the economy more efficient and internationally competitive, and improving the environment by preventing pollution. These programs largely work with the private sector to develop and deploy new and more efficient technologies, as well as saving energy on the local level through state energy conservation programs (SECP) and low-income weatherization. We concur with OMB Director Alice Rivlin's statement that ''funding for these programs must also be restored significantly to reach acceptable levels.''

The approximately 50 percent reduction in funding for low-income weatherization and SECP is of special concern to us. Many thousand fewer homes will receive economically empowering energy efficiency improvements this winter because of the proposed Congressional cuts.

We applaud your continuing leadership in this area and stand ready to support you in insisting on a strong federal energy efficiency program.

Sincerely,

Edward J. Markey; Sidney R. Yates; Frank Pallone, Jr.; Martin Olav Sabo; Barney Frank; John D. Dingell; Joe Moakley; Vic Fazio; Ronald V. Dellums; John W. Olver; Jerrold Nadler; Patrick J. Kennedy; Lucille Roybal-Allard; Bernard Sanders; Dale E. Kildee; Alcee Hastings; Sam Farr; James P. Moran; Earl Hilliard; Maurice Hinchey; Jim McDermott; Robert T. Matsui; Harry Johnston II; James A. Traficant; Carolyn Maloney; Nita M. Lowey; Ike Skelton; Charles E. Schumer; Thomas J. Manton; John Lewis; William Clay; José Serrano; Anthony C. Beilenson; Lane Evans; Gerry E. Studds; Sam Gejdenson; Jack Reed; Nydia Velazquez; Ed Towns; John Conyers; Richard E. Neal; George E. Brown, Jr.; Rosa DeLauro; Ed Pastor; Peter DeFazio; David E. Skaggs; Sherrod Brown; Eliot Engel; Tom Barrett; Bill Richardson; Elizabeth Furse; Sander Levin; Henry Waxman; George Miller; James Oberstar; Ron Wyden; Louis Stokes; Louise Slaughter; Lynn Rivers; Bruce Vento; Earl Pomeroy; Barbara Kennelly; Major Owens; Patricia Schroeder; David R. Obey; Benjamin L. Cardin; David Bonior; Tim Johnson.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this conference report.

There are many reasons to vote against this report, and there are lots of reasons for the President to veto this bill, which he certainly will in its present form.

Let me focus on just one of the important reasons why Members should vote against the conference report and that is because of the language which will lead to increased federal spending and accelerated logging in the Tongass National Forest.

On November 15, the house voted 230 to 199 to instruct the conferees to drop the Tongass logging rider from this legislation. They haven't done that. What they have done instead is to return to the floor with a cosmetic coverup of more taxpayer subsidies for clearcutting this rainforest.

As one of the architects of the Tongass Timber Reform Act of 1990, I can assure you that this rider is offensive to the goal of that act, which was to modernize forest management. This rider tries to turn the clock back to the days when subsidized clearcutting took priority over all other uses of the forest.

The Tongass rider requires that an outdated, scientifically discredited draft timber plan shall govern management of the National Forest for the next 2 years. What that means is that logging is authorized at a rate of 418 million board feet per year, 100 million board feet over the historic average. Even though the Forest Service already has a solid scientific basis and has rejected this plan as allowing an unsustainable, environmentally destructive rate of harvest, the rider would impose the plan by congressional edict for 2 years.

To add further insult, the rider has sufficiency language which is intended to overturn environmental lawsuits applying to existing sales.

Even at current rates of logging, the Tongass has the Nation's most heavily subsidized timber program. According to GAO, between 1992 and 1994, the cash flow deficit to the Treasury was $102 million. If we adopt this rider, losses to the Treasury could increase by another $18 million annually.

And what are we getting for the taxpayer's money? We're taking 400-year-old trees from the rainforest and turning them into pulp. I don't recall that provision being in the Republican Contract With America.

I do recall that during the timber salvage sale debate on the rescissions bill last March, Members were told that the amendment jointly applied to dead, dying, and burnt trees. What has happened is that we got a lot more than we were told about, including cutting of healthy, green old-growth timber in the Northwest.

Don't get fooled again. Vote against this conference report.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this conference report. While this bill contains many important elements for natural resource dependent communities, I want to highlight one very important provision that was included in the conference committee yesterday by Senator GORTON.

This provision calls for the National Park Service to extend the lease at Pearson Airpark in the city of Vancouver past the year 2002. This is a key element in my legislation (H.R. 2172) to create the Fort Vancouver National Historic Reserve. While I anticipate that my legislation will pass the House next year, I am supportive of efforts to expedite the process with respect to Pearson Airpark. The designation of the Fort Vancouver National Historic

Reserve will, of course, go through the normal authorizing process.

It was important to expedite the extension of the lease to give the city of Vancouver and the M.J. Murdock trust the certainty they need to forge ahead with the construction of the Murdock Aviation Museum. This will be a Smithsonian quality museum that will highlight the rich aviation history in the city of Vancouver. This legislation will go a long way to making this museum a reality.

I urge my colleagues to support this conference report.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in strong support of the conference report on the Department of the Interior Appropriations Act. This appropriations bill contains a moratorium on new listings of endangered or threatened species or new designations of critical habitat under the Endangered Species Act. This moratorium is based on my Farm, Ranch and Homestead Protection Act.

The Endangered Species Act has destroyed the rights of hardworking, taxpaying American families for the sake of blind cave spiders, fairy shrimp, and golden-cheeked warblers. Until Congress reauthorizes the Endangered Species Act to balance the rights of landowners and common sense with environmental concerns, we must protect American landowners by putting regulators on a leash. This amendment would extend the regulatory moratorium on listing of endangered or threatened species or designation of critical habitat until Congress reauthorizes the Endangered Species Act.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Without objection the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

There was no objection.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. YATES

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the conference report?

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, very much.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The clerk will report the motion.

The clerk read as follows:

Mr. YATES moves to recommit the conference report on the bill H.R. 1977 to the committee of conference with instructions to the managers on the part of the House to insist on the House position on the amendment of the Senate numbered 108. In order to protect the Tongass National Forest from increased timber harvests.

□ 1515

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 187, nays 241, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 853]

YEAS—187

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Berman
Bevill
Bishop
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Cardin
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Durbin
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Holden
Hoyer
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klink
LaFalce
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lincoln
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Pomeroy
Poshard
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Richardson
Rivers
Roemer
Rose
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Spratt
Stark
Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Walsh
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NAYS—241

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brewster
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Cooley
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Funderburk
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lucas
Manton
Manzullo
Martini
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Montgomery
Moorhead
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Riggs
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas
Thornberry
Torkildsen
Traficant
Upton
Vucanovich
Walker
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—4

McInnis
Tucker
Velazquez
Waldholtz

□ 1535

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Ms. Velázquez for, with Mr. McInnis against.

Mr. PACKARD changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay''.

Ms. WATERS and Messrs. FARR, BERMAN, CHAPMAN, and PETERSON of Florida, changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea''.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The question is on the conference report.

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 7 of rule XV, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 244, nays 181, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 854]

YEAS—244

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brewster
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn

Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Christensen
Chrysler
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cooley
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cunningham
Danner
Davis
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Doolittle
Dornan
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Funderburk
Ganske
Gekas
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Houghton
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Lincoln
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lucas
Manzullo
Martini
Mascara
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McIntosh
McKeon
McNulty
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Pickett
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Reed
Regula
Riggs
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Seastrand
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Torkildsen
Traficant
Upton
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wise
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NAYS—181

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Berman
Bevill
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Cardin
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Cubin
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Durbin
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hayworth
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Holden
Hostettler
Hoyer
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klink
LaFalce
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
McCarthy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Moran
Morella
Nadler
Neumann
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pomeroy
Poshard
Rangel
Richardson
Rivers
Roemer
Rose
Roth
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Spratt
Stark
Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Williams
Wilson
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NOT VOTING—7

Callahan
Chenoweth
Hancock
McInnis
Tucker
Velazquez
Waldholtz

☐ 1553

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. McInnis for, with Ms. Velázquez against.

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsidered was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT ON AMENDMENTS TO THE COMPREHENSIVE ANTITERRORISM ACT

(Mr. SOLOMON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee may be meeting as soon as this Saturday, December 16, to grant a rule which may limit the amendments to be offered to H.R. 1710, the Comprehensive Antiterrorism Act of 1995.

Subject to the approval of the Rules Committee, this rule may include a provision limiting amendments to those specified in the rule. Any Member who desires to offer an amendment should submit 55 copies and a brief explanation of the amendment by 4 p.m. on Friday, December 15, to the Rules Committee, at room H–312 in the Capitol.

Amendments should be drafted to the text of the Hyde-Barr substitute, which has been printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of December 5, and which has also been introduced as a separate bill (H.R. 2703). The rule is likely to self-execute in the Hyde-Barr amendment as a new base text for H.R. 1710.

Members should use the Office of Legislative Counsel to ensure that their amendments are properly drafted and should check with the Office of the Parliamentarian to be certain their amendments comply with the rules of the House.

FURTHER CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1530, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996

Mr. SPENCE submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 1530) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1996 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes:

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR DEBATE AND CONSIDERATION OF THREE MEASURES RELATING TO U.S. TROOP DEPLOYMENTS IN BOSNIA

Mr. SOLOMON, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104–405) on the resolution (H. Res. 304) providing for debate and for consideration of three measures relating to the deployment of U.S. Armed Forces in and around the territory of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PROVIDING FOR DEBATE AND CONSIDERATION OF THREE MEASURES RELATING TO UNITED STATES TROOP DEPLOYMENTS IN BOSNIA

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 304, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 304

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to debate the deployment of United States Armed Forces in and around the territory of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations.

SEC. 2. After debate pursuant to the first section of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2770) to prohibit Federal funds from being used for the deployment on the ground of United States Armed Forces in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina as part of any peacekeeping operation, or as part of any implementation force. The bill shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by Representative Dornan of California and an opponent. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

SEC. 3. After disposition of or postponement of further proceedings on H.R. 2770, it shall be in order to consider in the House the resolution (H. Res. 302) relating to the deployment of United States Armed Forces in and around the territory of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina to enforce the peace agreement between the parties to the conflict in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina. The resolution shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by Representative Buyer of Indiana and an opponent. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution to final adoption without intervening motion.

SEC. 4. After disposition of or postponement of further proceedings on House Resolution 302, it shall be in order to consider in the House a resolution relating to the deployment of United States Armed Forces in and around the territory of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina offered by the Minority Leader or his designee. The resolution shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution to final adoption without intervening motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of the resolution, all time yielded is for debate purposes only.

(Mr. SOLOMON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous materials.)

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, the rule before us in designed to enable the enable House to debate the President's policy of deploying American ground troops to Bosnia as part of a NATO peacekeeping contingent.

Because the peace agreement is scheduled to be signed in Paris tomorrow, and because the President has asked the Congress to vote on the deployment of U.S. troops before the peace agreement is signed, we are taking this unusual action of a same-day consideration rulemaking this debate in order. It, therefore, can be legitimately argued this qualifies as an urgent or emergency matter on those grounds.

Having said that, however, I want to make clear that my own preference would have been that we not vote on anything today since the House has already twice expressed its overwhelming opposition to send American troops in Bosnia. That should have been sufficient. I seriously doubt that many minds have been changed since our last vote on November 17—less than a month ago.

However, it was the feeling of our conference, and of many Members on the other side of the aisle, that the House should vote again on the President's policy, because it was not officially and fully unveiled or presented, until after that last vote took place on this floor. That's an understandable argument for today's debate and votes, even if I don't happen to agree with it.

The rule before us will give the House ample time to both debate the President's Bosnia policy, and to vote on three distinct alternatives measures. Under the rule before us, there will first be 1 hour of general debate on the subject of deploying American troops to Bosnia, equally divided between the chairman and ranking minority member of the International Relations Committee.

Following that debate, the rule first makes it in order to consider in the House a bill introduced by Representative DORNAN of California, H.R. 2770, which prohibits the use of appropriated funds for deploying American troops to Bosnia. That bill will be debated for 1 hour, divided between Mr. DORNAN and an opponent. It will not be subject to amendment but will be subject to one motion to recommit which may contain instructions.

Following the disposition of the Dornan bill, the House will consider a sense-of-the-House resolution, House Resolution 302, by Representative BUYER of Indiana. The Buyer resolution first calls attention to the previous two House votes in opposition to sending our troops to Bosnia, and the President's subsequent decision to do so anyway, notwithstanding those votes.

The resolution then reiterates, and this is important, the concerns and the opposition of the House to the President's policy, but goes on to express for American servicemen and women who will be deployed to Bosnia and calls for their full protection, and the supply of sufficient resources to carry out the mission.

The Buyer resolution will be debated in the House for 1 hour, and is not subject to amendment or to a motion to recommit.

Finally, the rule allows the minority leader or his designee to offer a resolution in the House on the subject to United States troop deployment to Bosnia, debatable under the same terms and conditions as the Buyer resolution.

Let me emphasize that we are talking about three, free-standing measures, each of which will have a separate vote, regardless of the outcome of votes on the other measures. This is not a king-of-the-hill or most-votes procedure. It is conceivable that all three measures could pass, that all three measures could be defeated, or that only one or two could pass.

The House will be able to work its will on all three.

Mr. Speaker, I know there will be some who will still criticize this process for one reason or another. It is not perfect, but it does allow for substantial debate on at least three options. I say ''at least three options'' since the minority is also protected in its right to offer a motion to recommit the Dornan bill with amendatory instructions subject to 10 minutes of debate. So, there could actually be four alternatives before the House today.

Mr. Speaker, the process will still be criticized by some, I suppose, because none of the measures has been reported for a committee or is subject to amendment.

But the President's Bosnia policy has been the subject of considerable hearings and discussions in several committees of the House and Senate, as well as the subject of the previous debates and votes on this floor which I have already referred to.

So, while this may not be a perfect process, I think it is still fair and open in giving this House the ample amount of debate time that many have asked for on the President's Bosnia policy, and the opportunity to choose among several alternatives in response to that policy. By the end of the day today, there should be no question as to where this House stands. I personally remain adamantly opposed to the present policy of placing American troops in harm's way in a place where they are not wanted and do not belong.

□ 1600

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. HALL of Ohio asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend my colleague from New York, Mr. SOLOMON, for bringing this resolution to the floor.

House Resolution 304 is a rule which would permit the consideration of three, free-standing bills in response to our commitment to use United States troops to bring peace to Bosnia and implement the Dayton peace accord. The three bills are H.R. 2770, introduced by Mr. DORNAN; House Resolution 302, introduced by Mr. BUYER and Mr. SKELTON, and a Democratic alternative, offered by the minority leader or his designee.

As my colleague form New York has ably described, this rule provides 1 hour of general debate, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations. The rule further provides for 1 hour of debate for each of the other three proposals. No amendments are permitted.

I must express my disappointment with the process on this rule. We all knew that the President asked Congress for a vote of support for the troops. We have had weeks to plan this rule. However, not even 3 hours ago, key decisions had not been made on this process. Now we are debating this on this floor. As a matter of fact we just debated on the rule 15 minutes ago. This is a vital matter of war and peace. Ram-rodding this issue through the House on such a grave issue does a disservice to Members on both sides of this question.

Mr. Speaker, there are two issues of substance at stake here. The first issue

is whether the United States will be a leader for world peace. We have an opportunity to bring peace to a turbulent region in Europe that has been ravaged by war for 4 years. Opportunities like this do not come about easily or often. We should seize the chance for peace while we have it.

The second issue is whether we will support our President and retain credibility in the international community. Or will we tie the hands of our President, embarrass ourselves, and let down our supporters and friends in Europe. President Clinton has taken a bold step for peace. We should back him up.

This past summer, I traveled to the former Yugoslavia and witnessed the terrible conditions there. When I visited refugees in Tuzla and Zenica, I saw many children that had not only lost their homes. They had lost hope. When I looked into the eyes of these children, I saw pain, confusion, and sadness. I found that many of these children had not been immunized or educated during the 4 years of the Bosnian war.

When I returned to America, I called Carol Bellamy, the executive director of UNICEF, and asked her to help implement a plan to immunize the children of Bosnia. She quickly pulled together a detailed proposal.

Two weeks ago, I was with President Clinton at the White House when he endorsed the proposal and he pledged funding. This humanitarian initiative is now going on. I compliment the President for supporting the children.

My constituents and I have a special reason for wanting the peace process to go forward. The treaty between the warring factions was negotiated at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, which is partly in my district. We are proud of the role that we played in the crafting of this agreement.

Two days ago, the mayor of the city of Dayton and all the city commissioners signed a proclamation expressing pride and support for the men and women of our Armed Forces who are helping to implement the Dayton peace agreement. The resolution also calls on ''all nations of the world to support the Dayton peace agreement.''

I would like to insert the text of the proclamation in the RECORD.

The rule before us will give House Members an opportunity to support he President and peace. I regret that the rule did not make in order a proposal by Mr. KENNEDY that would have required our NATO allies to pick up the costs associated with this mission.

Mr. Speaker, our national security interests are at stake. I urge defeat of the Dornan bill, defeat of the Buyer/Skelton resolution, and support of the Democratic alternative.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the proclamation to which I referred.

PROCLAMATION

Whereas, The Dayton Peace Agreement represents an opportunity for all parties within Bosnia and Herzegovina to work toward building a lasting peace for its people; and

Whereas, the last four years have yielded untold suffering of families and innocent victims who have lost homes, friends, and a way of life to the worst atrocities and war in Europe since World War II; and

Whereas, The Dayton Peace Agreement calls for free and democratic elections to be held throughout Bosnia and Herzegovina, and commits all parties, including Serbia and Croatia, to cooperate fully and abide by international humanitarian law; and

Whereas, The Dayton Peace Agreement also commits all parties in Bosnia and Herzegovina to respect the highest level of internationally recognized human rights; and

Whereas, The Dayton Peace Agreement acknowledges the need for international assistance to help the people of Bosnia and Herzegovina rebuild communities after the devastation of four years of war; and

Whereas, The Dayton Peace Agreement is testimony to the leadership that The United States and its allies must play not only to preserve peace, but to build peace in the world.

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the City of Dayton Ohio, and its citizens commend all the parties in Bosnia and Herzegovina for courageously agreeing to peace for all its people; and

Be it further resolved, that the City of Dayton, where, through leadership of the United States and its allies, terms and conditions for a fair and just peace were forged, extends its hopes and prayers to the people of Bosnia and Herzegovina that their peace may be lasting and free; and

Be it further resolved, that the City of Dayton with pride and support wish the men and women well, of our armed forces, who will assist the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in implementing the Dayton Peace Agreement; and

Be it further resolved, that the City of Dayton commits to working with Sister Cites International in providing a network of cities to assist our counterparts in further building the peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina; and

Be it further resolved, that the City of Dayton encourages all nations of the world to support the Dayton Peace Agreement.

Signed and presented to the President of the United States, William J. Clinton, December 11, 1995.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I have to take exception to the statement of my very good friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL], that we are ramming these measures through the House.

My colleagues, let us be perfectly clear about it, the reason we are on this floor here today over my objections, I might add, because I do not think we should be here, period, is because President Clinton has asked Speaker GINGRICH to have this body take another vote on this issue before the Paris signing tomorrow. That is why we are here today. If it were not for that request, I can guarantee you that I would not have let this matter come before this body today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DIAZ-BALART], a very respected new member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I will support this rule because it gives ample opportunity to the Congress to support the very serious question of the Bosnia intervention. In the last 2 weeks, in multiple discussions held with colleagues in this House about the imposition of the Clinton administration of the new Secretary General, Mr. Solana, of NATO, various colleagues have stated to me that that decision by the Clinton administration seriously and legitimately calls into question the foreign policy judgment of the administration.

Mr. Speaker, NATO of course is the military wing of the western alliance. It was greatly responsible for maintaining the security of Europe throughout the cold war and, of course, today we are poised to intervene militarily in an armed conflict in Europe for the first time since World War II and in the Balkans under the military shield and utilizing the military structure of NATO for the first time in history.

Thus even though NATO was always important, it is perhaps even more important today. So who is the man who was named last week in Brussels as the new Secretary general, the head of NATO? Javier Solana is the foreign minister of the Spanish Socialist Workers party government. Mr. Solana opposed NATO with vehemence throughout the 1970's and the 1980's. As late as 1986, when a Socialist-sponsored referendum was held in Spain to determine whether it would remain in NATO, Mr. Solana, then culture minister in the Spanish Government, was one of the most outspoken opponents of Spain remaining in NATO.

He also opposed the presence of United States military bases on Spanish soil. As late as 1985, precisely on that subject of the presence of United States bases on Spanish soil, he I think somewhat contemptuously stated, and I quote, If need be, we will send a copy of the Spanish Constitution to Washington so they will know what a sovereign country is.

Until September 29, 1979, Mr. Solana was formerly a Marxist. That is the date that his party, the Socialist Workers Party, erased the word Marxist from its political program so as to help and win the next Spanish general election. Despite the opposition of almost all western Europe, the Clinton administration, Mr. Speaker, insisted upon Mr. Solana to be the new NATO Secretary General.

Much of the military and intelligence community of the NATO countries simply could not understand why the Clinton administration would insist on Solana as the new NATO head with other available candidates in contention such as Mr. Ruud Lubbers, former Dutch Prime Minister, who was endorsed by France and Germany and Great Britain and was always a dedicated supporter of NATO with exemplary security credentials.

The Clinton administration insisted on imposing the Spanish Socialist Solana as we prepare to use NATO to intervene militarily in Europe for the

first time since World War II, despite the fact that the Spanish Government is being wracked by unprecedented corruption, despite the fact that Solana, while Spanish Foreign Minister, just ended a 6-month stint as chairman of the European Union and during that time named a buddy of his, Mr. Garcia Vargas, a former defense minister in the Spanish Cabinet, who was so personally affected by corruption, including illegal wiretapping that he had to resign from the Spanish Cabinet. Mr. Solana named him European Union Special Envoy to Basnia.

□ 1615

Most importantly, Mr. Speaker, despite the fact that Spain is not part of the military structure of NATO, that was the candidate, that Foreign Minister of that government that is not part of the military wing of NATO, was the imposition of the Clinton administration for Secretary General of NATO, and that is the administration that is now asking the American people and the Congress to trust it with respect to Bosnia. I think this debate is long overdue, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say before I yield to my friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSON], that the chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], took issue with the fact that I said that we were ramrodding this rule through this process. I say to the gentleman, I really believe that, Mr. SOLOMON, and I know that the gentleman is trying to react to the fact that the President is going to the peace signing tomorrow, but I must say that we have known about the fact that we wanted to have this debate, and it has been many weeks in coming, and what has happened is that we had a Committee on Rules in which we just passed a rule 20 minutes ago of which we have three amendments; not three amendments, three bills and one rule. Only one amendment has any teeth in it; it is the Dornan amendment, because in fact it is really law if it would pass. The other two are sense of Congress. But of the other two, one is changing, and probably as I am talking, the Skelton-Buyer amendment. At least it was changing as of 110 minutes ago. I just got the Democratic alternative, which to me as I read very quickly is I wish it could be stronger, and the fact is that it is being ramrodded, and it is a heck of a way to debate probably one of the more important issues that we re debating this whole year, is the commitment of troops.

So, it is being ramrodded. I realize the pressure that the chairman is under, but I must stick by my original comment, that this is a heck of a way to bring up a serious issue like this, and I very much object to it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSON], a very distinguished member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding me such a generous amount of time.

Mr. Speaker, the rule before us provides for consideration of what is clearly one of the most significant foreign policy measures we shall take up in the foreseeable future, the measure dealing with congressional support, or disapproval, of the President's decision to send troops to Bosnia-Herzegovina to participate in the peacekeeping operation there. This is a decision we all hope will mark the beginning of the end of the tragic conflict.

With respect to the rule itself, our main concern in fashioning it was enough time be provided so that Members on both sides of the aisle and on all sides of the issue have an adequate opportunity to offer their arguments and to hear the opinions and arguments of other Members. We should have preferred more debate time, and many of us felt that a full day of debate was necessary for a measure of this significance. We do hope that every Member who has a desire to be heard during this important debate is given the opportunity to speak during the time that is provided under this rule.

Mr. Speaker, for almost 4 years now most Americans have been angered and sickened by the seemingly endless savagery and destruction being perpetrated in the lands that comprise the former Yugoslavia—and have urged and prayed that someone, somewhere, would try to put an end to the suffering.

Finally, after years of failure of the combatants themselves and of their neighbors in Europe to stop the fighting, the United States has stepped in and done what every decent and caring American has wanted.

We have asserted our leadership of NATO and participated in air strikes that sent an unmistakable signal for the first time that continued aggression would be punished forcefully, and we have asserted the moral authority that only the United States seems to represent to many people throughout the world and have brokered a peace treaty between the former combatants.

Finally there has been a cessation of hostilities; finally,a peace agreement has been approved by all the warring parties.

I hope one can assume, up to this point at least, virtually all Americans approve of and applaud what we have done. Yet many Americans are voicing unalterable opposition to sending any U.S. personnel to help enforce this newly achieved peace agreement, and even more are questioning the advisability of such further involvement by us in attempting to help keep this tragic conflagration from restarting.

That is an entirely proper and normal concern, it seems to me. In fact, it should be part of the debate that we have not really had since the end of the cold war, about what the international role of the United States should be, and when and where, and under what circumstances, we should use our Armed Forces other than to repel a direct attack upon our own Nation.

It has, understandably, been difficult since the end of the cold war to agree upon a role for the United States to play in world affairs. The threats to us, and to much of the rest of the free world, are certainly less obvious and less specific than they used to be. But it has become painfully clear over the past few years that concerted efforts to help bring about the results most of us in the United States would hope for seem unable to be brought about successfully without active involvement and, in fact, leadership from the United States.

Now we are faced with a peace agreement that was made possible by American-led NATO air strikes and American diplomacy, and one that all of the parties want American forces to help carry out. One could argue that it does not necessarily follow that we cannot now walk away from a truly hopeful situation that we were instrumental in creating, but if Americans really want us to do just that, it probably would have been better for us not to have tried to end the fighting in the first place.

Not everyone agrees, of course, but some of us like the idea that the world looks to us for leadership so long as we determine how, and when, and whether we should respond. In this case we are not faced with the situation confronted by the British, French, and other nations' troops under the banner of the United Nations, who have tried to enforce a peace on warring parties that required their being in the middle of an ongoing war.

The parties have now agreed to stop fighting, and our troops will be in the position, finally, of peacekeepers, rather than peacemakers, which was sadly the position in which the United States troops found themselves both in Somalia and in Lebanon. In this current case, too, the Pentagon itself is satisfied with the role our troops will play and the circumstances in which they will be deployed which represents a complete about-face from their position, quite a proper one it seems too, I think all of us over the past couple of years were against committing United States troops to Bosnia for war-fighting purposes.

If our military, which is far and away the most capable, best-trained, and best-equipped in the world, is ever to be deployed for purposes other than defending our own territory, this, it seems to many of us, is the best possible use.

We are proud of the fine men and women of our Armed Forces, and if we are ever to use them at all, we can think of no better way than that of honest peace-keeping in a situation

where our presence, United States presence, literally will make all the difference.

There is no one here in Washington who wants us to be the policeman of the world, or solely responsible for enforcing the peace in Bosnia or anywhere else, but this is the kind of cooperative and multilateral effort that many Americans have, for many years now, called for and insisted upon, and it is being done under rules of engagement that provide that American troops will be under American command, and that they will have the authority to respond immediately, and with overwhelming force.

It may not be possible for us to define to our own satisfaction, and in advance, exactly when and in what capacity American troops should be used in this new and more complicated—if oftentimes less threatening—world than we used to face during the cold war, but we are a moral, and a caring, and a peace-seeking people; we take our ideals and beliefs seriously; and, when our involvement, with others, will stop the kind of terrible suffering that has been going on in this corner of Eastern Europe for 4 years now, common decency and concern for other human beings dictates that we do what we can.

President Clinton, in fact, offered a useful, pragmatic, and yet moral policy for this Nation to follow in the years immediately ahead, and I quote him, if I may, Mr. Speaker: ''We cannot stop war for all time, but we can stop some wars. We cannot save all women and all children, but we can save many of them. We can't do everything, but we must do what we can.''

This is something we can do, and it is something we must do, if we are to have any respect for ourselves and for this great Nation whose people we are privileged to represent.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Sanibel, FL [Mr. GOSS], a very distinguished member of the Committee on Rules who has been very much involved in this issue.

(Mr. GOSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee from Glens Falls, Mr. SOLOMON, for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, let me begin by saying that I support the rule to allow this critical debate to come to the floor. The rule provides for ample debate time especially since this body has debated and spoken clearly twice recently, and it provides for consideration of a range of motions, fairly representing—in my opinion—the broad range of views and conflicting positions held by Members of this body. There is no question that the President has used his authority to deploy troops—against the clear wishes of this House of Congress. Nevertheless, we must deal with the situation as it exists. It is a curious situation. Why is the President flying to Paris on December 13 when we are in budget crisis that threatens to shutdown Government Friday? Where do the President's priorities lie?

But Mr. Speaker, as we prepare to begin this debate that has national and international ramifications, I want to take a minute to talk about individuals—those I represent in southwest Florida and those who will be spending a cold winter in the hills of war-ravaged Bosnia under the Dayton agreement and the President's plan. This past weekend I held two town meetings, and the topic that evoked the sharpest response from my constituents at these meetings was Bosnia. Not Medicare, not the budget, but Bosnia. And the questions were direct and heartfelt and to the point: Why are we putting our young men and women on the ground in Bosnia? These were not political people asking political questions—these were honest folks demanding an answer.

I have listened to the President and his advisors and his spokesmen, and I still cannot find a convincing answer. I have yet to be convinced that the United States has a compelling reason to put people on the ground in Bosnia. I say ''people,'' because these are individuals—sons and daughters—who will be put in harm's way. And it is not a country or an army that will suffer casualties and loss of life if things go wrong; it is those individual people.

In considering where to go from here, I cannot support a complete withdrawal of funds and support for the United States troops who are already on the ground in the former Yugoslavia. These men and women are wearing the uniform of the U.S. military and obeying orders, and we cannot leave them stranded in hostile territory. I would like to see them brought home, however, and I certainly will not give the President a blanket approval to continue as he sees fit. Because too many Americans have taken the time to tell me that they strongly disagree with the President's actions so far. In addition I have serious questions about the role of NATO in this operation, and the arrangements for burden sharing that have been put together. Our forces have been trained in conventional warfare, and are the best in the world—however, the greatest threat in Bosnia comes from unconventional sources. And I am concerned that when it comes time to withdraw our troops under the President's plan, extraction will be extremely difficult.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I do want to draw attention to the parallel that many inside and outside the administration are drawing between the mission in Bosnia and the mission in Haiti. I think this is a good comparison, but not, I suspect, for the same reasons as the White House. It is a useful comparison because despite a virtual media blackout and attempts by the Clinton administration to spin the situation otherwise, the conditions in Haiti are deteriorating and could very well collapse as soon as our troops leave. We are reminded that efforts at nation building are not as simple as they seem, and that internal problems of foreign countries spanning many generations cannot be solved by a year of occupation by the United States Armed Forces, especially in difficult terrain, harsh climate, and the dangerous atmosphere we know is Bosnia. And we are disarming in Haiti and rearming in Bosnia. I urge my colleagues to support the rule.

□ 1630

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HASTINGS].

(Mr. HASTINGS of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL], for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose this rule because it promotes wishy-washiness. The gentleman from New York, [Mr. SOLOMON], the chairman of the committee, has commented on the fact that we have had hearings in other committees. We have, but not about the particular language that we are getting ready to vote on. There have been no committee hearings in that regard. I have been to every hearing on the Committee on International Relations that was officially held concerning Bosnia. It does not permit any amendments, and then we are just seeing the language, as I speak. It is a work in progress. We do not have any idea what we are getting ready to vote on. This is political posturing in the extreme.

Mr. Speaker, we were sent here to lead, not to seek cover for our political, personal safety. What do we have with this rule? Cut off the troops. The other body just voted something like that. We voted on Hefley here on authorization. The other body just rejected that soundly, 77 to 22. Trash the President but support the troops. You all trash the President every day around here, so what else is new about that? Support the troops? But we have some reservations.

Is this leadership? We should support the President, any President, Republican or Democrat, when they deploy troops under their constitutional aegis, and we should promote and praise the troops that I saw when I was in Croatia this past weekend. These children are magnificent, and we should reject this rule. Here is why.

Let me quote, for those who keep asking, ''What is the stake for the United States, and why does United States participation make a difference?'' Admiral Leighton Smith, a four-star in charge of every American child in that theater, said:

> The question is about United States leadership in the world. If we don't go in, our credibility goes to rock bottom.

Let me repeat again what Admiral Leighton Smith said, in response to the question ''What is the United States' stakes in Bosnia, and why does United States participation make a difference?'' He said:

> The question is about United States leadership in the world. If we don't go in, our credibility goes to rock bottom. The next time, when vital U.S. interests are engaged, our allies and friends are not going to be with us. If we don't go in, there will be more killing and the war can spread. Do not underestimate the volatility of the Balkans.

What I saw in the way of destruction in Sarajevo, no man or woman in this body can say that we should not somehow or other, as the leader of the world, promote a period of decency and give peace a chance.

Reject this rule.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to my friend, the gentleman from Florida, ALCEE HASTINGS, who is leaving the floor there, and he is a good friend, but I have just about heard all I am going to hear on this. This bill is on this floor because the President asked for it to be here. Mr. Speaker, I would just as soon pull this rule. We do not need to debate this today. However, if you are going to continue trashing us, we might as well do that. Keep that in mind. We are bending over backwards to be fair, I want to tell the gentleman, and he can trust my sincerity in that.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, we have 97 people on the ground in Tuzla, 97, scouts, that is all. It snowed 2½ feet yesterday. There were 16 flights ready to go in, not big C–141's and certainly not C–5 Galaxies, Hercules, hard landing aircraft. One got in out of 16. I am waiting for a weather report right now. I do not think anybody got in today. It is snowing again.

I am the one who drove this, so we could have one more vote before we start the First Armored moving. I do not want this on the floor today after what I have just heard. I really do not. I want to give you time to study it all night.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DORNAN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief. I share with the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] the concern about that snow. The weather or the elements there are the most serious threat to our troops, but you do not pick your theater when you are trying to preserve some kind of semblance of peace. It is going to be a difficult theater. No war is risk free, and nobody here knows that better than he does, I would say to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for saying that. My problem is basically constitutional. I testified to this up at the Committee on Rules. Bless everybody's heart around here for loving our men and women in uniform going in harm's way.

I have spoken on this floor about the atrocities in Bosnia as much as anybody. I begged President Bush to do something, to hit those concentration camps with an air assault using Blackhawks with Cobra and Apache gunship support, and extract the people from the concentration camps. I did not want, and it is a rough word, but it is fair, I did not want the current President to dither away 3 years.

The other sides are not going to kill one another with three feet of snow. You cannot find your own land mines without landmarks, and I do not give Bill Clinton much advice, but if he wanted to be a hero with the First Armored Division, he could very easily, at Paris tomorrow, say:

> We are holding off the deployment because of the severe weather, and I am telling my young dads and moms in Europe that are on their way there, enjoy Christmas with your children and your wives. We will start moving on the 6th or 7th.

Imagine the cheer that would go up in the day rooms in Germany, which will probably have half a foot of snow, and nobody knows what the buildup in weather is going to be until Christmas. I just heard a European weather projection. They are predicting the worst weather since the winter of 1944 and 1945, which was the worst in 50 years, so I do not want this on the floor if we are going to have all this angst. Jerk it, and we can do it tomorrow, or better yet, Friday.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON].

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate hearing my friend, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HASTINGS], and his spirited comments a few moments ago. I would point out a phrase that he used: ''No war is risk free.'' Mr. Speaker, this is not a war. We are told that our troops are being sent there as peacekeepers, but I am afraid and I will explain this further in debate on the general bill and during the amendments, why this is not an evenhanded, impartial peacekeeping operation, and how it may very well end up in a very high-risk situation as far as our troops are concerned.

I would also point out that the bill that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BUYER] and I put forth, and on which there will be a vote later this evening, is based upon hearings that we had in the Committee on National Security. We had numerous hearings there. What is in there, we took from the hearings the testimony and combined it into this bill that we have put forth as number 302.

I also wish to point out that early on November 11, I set forth some eight conditions under which we could deploy troops to the country of Bosnia. I gave full expression of my concern in those eight conditions as of that moment. I tell this body, Mr. Speaker, that six of those conditions have been met, two have not been met.

As a result, I have chosen to be a principal cosponsor with my friend, the gentleman from Indiana, and I hope that when we reach that, that there will be a sizeable, sizeable vote in favor of it. I also will vote for this rule.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Greensboro, NC, Mr. HOWARD COBLE, a very distinguished Member of this body.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I am fresh off the Christmas parade circuit back home. I rode in nine Christmas parades. While these parades are not scientific polls, they are accurate barometers of public opinion. The consistent theme I heard from thousands at these Christmas parades was twofold: Do not back down on your effort to balance the budget, and stay out of Bosnia.

I spoke with many of these constituents personally, Mr. Speaker. They oppose our presence in Bosnia, not because they are insensitive or uncaring about the problems that plague Bosnia, but rather because they view it as a lose-lose proposition for the United States.

The reasons for this conclusion are apparent: No vital national interest in Bosnia; fighting that has endured over the centuries there is not likely to cease with the presence of 20,000 American men and women on the ground; severe, unforgiving inclement weather in a country generously laced with land mines located Lord only knows where.

Our Bosnian operation, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion is a recipe for failure at its best, a recipe for disaster at its worst. The arms embargo should have been lifted months ago, but that cannot be corrected at this late date.

America cannot continue, Mr. Speaker, to be the world's peacekeeper eternally. American men and women should not be placed in harm's way at this time, and virtually nothing, Mr. Speaker, has been said about the enormous cost to the American taxpayer. It has been estimated at $2 billion. All of us know that is the low end. It will exceed probably $3 to $4 billion, money that we do not have.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I reiterate the message of Christmas parade goers in the Sixth District of North Carolina: Stay out of Bosnia.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON].

(Mr. RICHARDSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, this is the most important national security vote that we have cast since the Persian gulf war. We have to ask ourselves, and that is what we are doing, why is United States involvement in

Bosnia in the national interest? There are three reasons:

First, America's values are at stake, and we can stop genocide and war in the Balkans.

Second, America's interests are at stake. We need a stable Europe, and Europe's stability is in danger if this war simmers.

Third, America's leadership is at stake. The peace agreement that we pushed, initialed, and fathered would collapse.

If we do not support the President on this issue, our credibility in other crisis areas, North Korea, the Middle East, Northern Ireland, and many other arenas will be eroded.

Mr. Speaker, over the last 4 years more than half of Bosnia' pre-war population has been murdered, starved, or driven from their homes. One million are homeless; one million. The people of Bosnia have witnessed Europe's worst human rights atrocities since the end of World War II: ethnic cleansings, mass executions, torture, rape. The only way to stop this killing for good is to make peace.

□ 1645

Our conscience demands that we seize this chance. America needs a strong Europe as our partner in fighting security threats from terrorism to proliferation of mass weapons of destruction, and Europe's stability is in danger if this war continues. Without United States participation, the peace agreement would literally collapse and the war would reignite and spread through Greece, Turkey, Macedonia. That is not in our interest. NATO would collapse literally.

Third, America's leadership brokered this cease-fire and brought the parties to Dayton to make peace. Now we have to take the lead in securing that peace.

This vote is not popular. My constituents let me know their views, too. But once in a while when national security and America's interests are at stake, we must take the tough votes. If we fail to keep our commitment in Bosnia, what is going to happen on North Korea and the nuclear issue? What are the North Koreans going to think? Or in containing Saddam Hussein in Iraq? Or in Northern Ireland and the Middle East where we are brokering peace?

If we fail to keep our commitment in Bosnia, the credibility of our leadership in Europe and around the world will suffer and with it our ability to protect America's interests.

Mr. Speaker, all of us here want to do the right thing. I cast no aspersions on any Members' motives. Therefore, we should do the right thing and support the President as we have done with President Bush in the Persian Gulf and other important national security votes.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS].

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to the time.

Mr. Speaker, just like the statement of the gentleman from North Carolina about the numbers of his constituents who have registered there opposition to the deployment of troops in Bosnia, I am here to report to the Congress that the same is true in my district. Even the gentleman who just preceded me in the well acknowledged that of his constituents. The question that was posed to our people by the action of the President is: Should we support deployment of troops in Bosnia? The answer is no.

But the next question now has to be asked, since the president has decided once and for all, without looking back and without any chance of changing his mind, that the troops will be deployed. So the question now that the people must register there opinions on is as follows: Shall we abandon our troops in Bosnia? The answer to that is no.

I cannot vote under any circumstances to abandon our troops. Not to fund them? Unheard of. I cannot support that. Not to supply them with foods, materiel, ammunition, all the weapons that they require to do their mission? All the accoutrements of carrying on a peacekeeping mission? I will not be a party of not supplying all that is needed to our troops. I will not abandon our troops. I deplore the action of the President, but it is his decision and I will abide by that decision and support it, but know well that it is a tragedy about to unfold.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER].

(Mr. HEFNER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I take a back seat to no one in the House. For years I have fought, as chairman of Military Construction, for quality of life for our troops and for better living conditions. And I have served on the Defense Subcommittee for a lot of years with my good friend, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG].

This is not a political argument. In my view we should not be trashing the President of the United States. This is the price that we pay for being who we are, the most powerful country on the face of the Earth, the only superpower that is left.

Our negotiators went to a part of the country where people had been fighting for 4 years, and we saw on our television screens the precious old grandmothers that were crying and trying to find their place and trying to get across the street to get water. We saw in the marketplace where they were being shelled, we saw the children with their limbs blown away. Total devastation. Something that would make any honest human being cringe at the atrocities that were being committed on these human beings.

There people all came together, and our negotiators said, ''We want you to come. You are tired of war, and we want you to come to Dayton, Ohio,'' in the great United States of America, in our chairman's home district. ''We want you to come, and you are going to sit down and we are going to talk about trying to come to grips with this, because we are so tired of war. We have people being slaughtered.''

The city of Sarajevo where we saw the beautiful winter games many years ago, the stadium now has now been turned into a cemetery, the buildings destroyed, people absolutely ravaged. Thousands have been buried in the skating rinks and the coliseum and all the places where we had the beautiful games. They have been turned into graveyards, and the stadium seats, the wood has been used to make coffins.

People were tired of war. So our negotiators said, ''Would you come to Dayton, Ohio? We will sit down, we will try come to some kind of a peace accord.'' They came and they hammered out and all the parties signed on to a peace agreement.

Every other time we have been involved in a confrontation, we have fought our way in, we have gone in with guns blazing. This is different. It may not work. But is it not worth, for God's sakes, to go in with other countries to try to make some effort to establish peace and to police a peace process for these people that have been so devastated in the past few years?

I would hope and pray at this time close to Christmastime that we should talk about peace on Earth and good will to men, that we would bypass the political cheap shots and at least make an effort to establish some peace in a part of the world that has been so devastated by the havoc that has been perpetrated on these citizens for so many years.

I would hope that we would support our troops and our effort to proclaim peace on Earth and good will to men this time at Christmastime.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COYNE].

(Mr. COYNE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support the effort to try to keep the peace and to send troops to Bosnia as part of the peace agreement recently reached in Dayton.

The United States has committed troops to serve in Bosnia as part of the NATO peacekeeping force.

The United States has been able to broker a peace agreement in Dayton among the various factions in Bosnia. As the President stated in his address to the Nation November 27, America's mission will not be fighting a war. ''It will be about helping the people of Bosnia to secure their own peace agreement.''

The United States mission in Bosnia is limited, focused, and under the command of the American general.

This deployment of troops in the United States's national interest. The

United States mediated the Dayton peace accord. If we want to be credible in future international negotiations, we must take the necessary steps to implement that which we have arranged. If we do not follow through in this instance, we will not have much credibility in any future negotiations.

Furthermore, the United States has a vital interest in maintaining stability in Europe. Instability in any part of that region can not only intensify but expand to include other countries as well. As we all know, events in Sarajevo earlier this century led to World War I and the eventual involvement of the United States in a very wide conflict. Only 20 years later, the United States was inescapably drawn into war in Europe again. And for most of the last 50 years, the United States has been involved in NATO because its national interests were threatened by the prospect of Soviet hegemony over Europe. Even today, when Soviet Union has collapsed, the United States has a powerful interest in promoting peace, democracy, and free trade within Europe and around the world.

It is important to point out that the emphasis in this deployment is peace—U.S. troops will be part of a peacekeeping force which is implementing a peace agreement made by the various warring factions. We will be administering a peace, not imposing one.

We now have an opportunity to make peace in a conflict which could—and I believe would—eventually widen and draw us into it. We must consider whether the eventual cost of standing idly by and allowing the war to continue might not eventually far exceed the cost of this peacekeeping mission.

We should also not forget that we are implementing a peace agreement which will end the continuing murder of innocent civilians. These crimes against humanity have been so horrible that the United Nations has established an international tribunal to investigate them. We can not claim to be a civilized nation if we turn our backs on torture and murder when we have the power in our hands to stop it.

In closing, I urge my colleagues to support the agreement in Dayton and support the U.S. military in its mission as a peacekeeping force in Bosnia.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. RAMSTAD].

(Mr. RAMSTAD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, this past weekend in Friedberg, Germany, I visited our troops of the 1st Armored Division, U.S. Army, who are being deployed to Bosnia.

One young soldier who served in both Somalia and Haiti told me, ''The Bosnian mission is so much harder to understand. We're going in as neutral peacekeepers but also to get the Bosnian Muslims armed. You can't have it both ways!''

Mr. Speaker, this young soldier points out the inherent contradiction in the Administration's Bosnia policy.

As Vice President GORE said on Meet the Press Sunday, ''We're going to make sure it (referring to arming the Bosnian Muslims) gets done.''

The President is putting 20,000 American lives in harm's way, as neutral peacekeepers, while simultaneously helping arm one of the combatants. You cannot have it both ways!

This past weekend, as part of the congressional fact finding mission to the Balkans, I also heard Admiral ''Snuffy'' Smith, IFOR Commander, say that he does not want to be involved in any way with equipping, arming or training the Bosnian Moslems. And he also said we're not neutral because the Serbs don't think we're neutral. After all, Mr. Speaker, we just bombed them into submission.

My overriding concern is that we are placing our troops in an untenable position and committing them to ''mission impossible.''

As Serbian President Milosevic told our delegation, ''If the Bosnians are armed, peace will be endangered and the treaty will fail.''

Mr. Speaker, the Dayton peace accord has a rigid formula on weaponry that, relatively speaking, ensures the Bosnian Moslems remain weak.

Therein lies the basic problem with the President's Bosnia policy. If a balance of power in the Balkans is not established, how in the world can we ever expect long-term peace and stability in the region?

Yes, we should lift the arms embargo. Yes, we should train and equip the Bosnian Moslems to defend themselves.

But, no, Mr. Speaker, not with 20,000 U.S. troops on Bosnia soil at the same time.

Let us establish the equilibrium of power in the Balkans by creating a stable military balance. But let us arm, equip and train the Bosnian Moslems in a neutral country and out of harm's way for 20,000 American troops.

Mr. Speaker, as we heard from every military officer on our recent trip to the Balkans, this is a very dangerous mission.

There are as many as 6 million land mines awaiting our troops in the snow where they are almost impossible to find.

Also, Bosnian Serb mortar and sniper positions are well-established. Our troops are being deployed primarily to Tuzla where 71 civilians were killed in a single mortar attack in May.

The mujahadeen—some 4,000 Islamic extremists—represent a real threat to our troops as well.

And as one commander put it, ''The threat of guerrilla warfare with grenades is very real.''

Mr. Speaker, our ambassador to Croatia told us that the biggest problem is Serb Sarajevo. He said, ''We can expect big trouble if the Serbs there don't accept the peace agreement.''

Yesterday, the Serbs in Sarajevo overwhelmingly rejected the agreement in a referendum.

As one Serb woman in Sarajevo told me, ''I would rather kill myself than accept the new boundaries.''

Mr. Speaker, I stand here with a heavy heart because I want to support our Commander in Chief on foreign policy matters, especially those involving U.S. troops.

However, Mr. Speaker, my first obligation is to our troops and their safety. I cannot and will not support a policy that is fundamentally flawed and inherently inconsistent.

But if our troops are deployed, as it now appears they will be, I will support them 100 percent and do everything I can to see than they return home safely and as soon as possible.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Youngstown, OH [Mr. TRAFICANT].

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, we forgot about some of these cities. Maybe that is the way to start this debate. There are great problems in Bosnia. There are great problems in America.

I support the rule. I commend the chairman for bringing the rule forward. He is trying to help the President. The President asked for this vote. This is a nonbinding, after-the-fact vote. The President has already decided to send troops into Bosnia.

I oppose sending troops into Bosnia for the following reasons: First, our generals have told us that Bosnia does not pose a security threat to the United States of America. Second, Europe has adequate manpower and money to handle this problem.

And, ladies and gentleman, we have been subsidizing Europe for too long as it is. These countries just dial 911 and we send over our troops to fight their problems, whether or not they have the money and the personnel or not. Then we send a credit card with them, an American Express card.

□ 1700

I am opposed to sending our troops. If, in fact, Europe cannot contain this civil war and it would spread. I would then support ground troops. But I cannot at this point.

Let me also say this: The Constitution speaks to these issues. Everybody who continues to talk about the history of Vietnam should take a look at the debate that is occurring in the House here tonight. Vietnam started with some trainers, some consultants, some technicians. That is about what we have.

But I think it is time to look at the Constitution. The Constitution is explicit. The founders took great pains to debate one issue: No one person could ever place America and our troops at war. And the potential for hostilities here is very great, folks.

So I do not think we are sending peacekeepers over to Bosnia. I think we are sending over targets, with bull's-eyes on their backs, and I believe this is a flawed policy.

But what bothers me in America anymore, the people do not govern. If the people govern, the House of Representatives and the other body would not allow for a nonbinding, after-the-fact vote on placing troops in harm's way. I think this is very bad move for us to make.

I am going to support the Dornan amendment, folks. I do not believe it will pass, and I will probably vote for every one of these nonbinding, after-the-fact, feel-good, kiss-your-sister types of votes here tonight. But it is not good policy, and the Congress of the United States should govern and the American people should govern, and right now, ladies and gentlemen, the American people do not govern anymore; governance comes from the White house.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER], one of the very most distinguished members of the Committee on International Relations.

(Mr. BEREUTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, a few minutes ago one of our Members stood up and said that he was opposed to sending ground troops to Bosnia, but once and for all the President has made the decision, so he is not going to be involved in abandoning our troops. That is pure nonsense, and I am sorry to say it came from this side of the aisle. I am appalled to hear something like that.

It can be stipulated that everyone in this body supports our troops, but we have a constitutional responsibility. It is to serve as a check on this President or any other President from the inappropriate deployment of American troops abroad. That is what we are here discussing in the Bosnia resolution that follows.

We will support our troops. That is clear.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DUNCAN].

(Mr. DUNCAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy said in 1961 we must face the fact that the United States is neither omnipotent nor omniscient, that we are only 6 percent of the world's population, that we cannot impose our will upon the other 94 percent, that we cannot right every wrong or reverse each adversity, and that there cannot be an American solution to every world problem. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy was right.

Twice in the last few days I have spoken on this floor to say something that I want to emphasize once again: There is absolutely no threat whatsoever to our national security because of what is going on in Bosnia.

Second, there is no vital United States interest in Bosnia, and we should never send young American soldiers to foreign battlefields or participate in any military adventure unless one of these conditions is unquestionably, unequivocally clear and certain. And there are many questions about, and much opposition to, our involvement in Bosnia.

I know that the pack mentality of those in our very liberal national news media has produced a drumbeat to try to gain support for this very ill-advised operation, but I really believe that this has much more to do with political correctness than it does with anything else. It is simply not politically fashionable today to be labeled as an isolationist. Yet someone who is not an isolationist and who wants good relations with and close ties to other nations still should be strongly against sending transportation to Bosnia.

First, Time magazine asked a few days ago on its cover the question: ''Is Bosnia worth dying for?'' It may be for Bosnians, but they should solve their own problems. It is not worth even one American life to temporarily stop this age-old conflict.

Second, even if by some miracle, for which I hope, we have no casualties, we still should oppose this mission.

We are $5 trillion in debt, Mr. Speaker, and almost everyone believes we will crash in a few years if we do not turn this around. Yet now we are going to spend billions we do not have in Bosnia, and we are going to, further, very seriously jeopardize the futures of our own children and grandchildren.

I feel sorry for the people in Bosnia. Humanitarian aid, yes; military aid, no. We can prove world leadership in many other ways.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, President Clinton ought to know that the American foreign policy has been to defend our democratic allies against external military attack that threatens the sovereignty of those nations that we are treaty-allied with or where America has a strong national interest that is threatened.

Mr. Speaker, there is no vital American national interest that would justify the taking of even one American life. President Clinton says we will hurt our standing with our NATO allies.

Well, if that were true, I would say, ''So what?'' It is still not worth one American life.

But even that is not true, Mr. Speaker. I have worked with our NATO allies as a member of the North Atlantic Assembly, the political arm of NATO, for the last 17 years. I am the chairman of the political foreign affairs committee of that body, and I can tell you that they are shocked that we would even consider putting American troops in harm's way when there is only a European interest and no American interest there. That is why we should do everything in our power to stop President Clinton from putting those troops there.

Because he has made the decision, I do believe that we are going to have to support the Buyer amendment, the Buyer resolution, because it does say that we oppose the policy but we support our troops, and that is something that we absolutely must do.

So let us get on with it. Let us pass this rule and then take up the general debate on the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground a quorum is not present and make the point of order a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 357, nays 70, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 855]

YEAS—357

Abercrombie	Buyer	Dornan
Ackerman	Callahan	Doyle
Allard	Calvert	Dreier
Archer	Camp	Duncan
Armey	Canady	Dunn
Bachus	Castle	Ehlers
Baesler	Chabot	Ehrlich
Baker (CA)	Chambliss	Emerson
Baker (LA)	Chapman	English
Ballenger	Chenoweth	Ensign
Barcia	Christensen	Eshoo
Barr	Chrysler	Evans
Barrett (NE)	Clayton	Everett
Barrett (WI)	Clement	Ewing
Bartlett	Clinger	Farr
Barton	Clyburn	Fawell
Bass	Coble	Fazio
Bateman	Coburn	Fields (LA)
Beilenson	Coleman	Fields (TX)
Bentsen	Collins (GA)	Flake
Bereuter	Combest	Flanagan
Berman	Condit	Foglietta
Bevill	Conyers	Foley
Bilbray	Cooley	Forbes
Bilirakis	Cox	Fowler
Bishop	Cramer	Fox
Bliley	Crane	Franks (CT)
Blute	Crapo	Franks (NJ)
Boehlert	Cremeans	Frelinghuysen
Boehner	Cubin	Frisa
Bonilla	Cunningham	Frost
Bonior	Danner	Funderburk
Bono	Davis	Gallegly
Borski	de la Garza	Ganske
Boucher	Deal	Gekas
Brewster	DeLauro	Gephardt
Browder	DeLay	Geren
Brown (CA)	Diaz-Balart	Gibbons
Brown (FL)	Dickey	Gilchrest
Brownback	Dicks	Gillmor
Bryant (TN)	Dingell	Gilman
Bunn	Dixon	Goodlatte
Bunning	Doggett	Goodling
Burr	Dooley	Gordon
Burton	Doolittle	Goss

Graham
Green
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Lincoln
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Longley
Lucas
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McDermott
McHugh
McIntosh
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meek
Menendez
Metcalf
Meyers
Mfume
Mica
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Nadler
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Ortiz
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Peterson (FL)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Reed
Regula
Riggs
Rivers
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roth
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Scott
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Studds
Stump
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thornton
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Torricelli
Traficant
Upton
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Ward
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Williams
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff

NAYS—70

Andrews
Baldacci
Becerra
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Cardin
Clay
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Costello
Coyne
DeFazio
Dellums
Deutsch
Durbin
Edwards
Engel
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Furse
Gejdenson
Gonzalez
Hall (OH)
Harman
Hefner
Jefferson
Johnson (SD)
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Lantos
Livingston
Lofgren
Lowey
McHale
Meehan
Miller (CA)
Moran
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Payne (NJ)
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Rangel
Richardson
Sanders
Sawyer
Schroeder
Schumer
Skaggs
Slaughter
Stark
Stokes
Stupak
Torres
Towns
Vento
Visclosky
Waters
Waxman
Weldon (PA)
Wyden
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—5

McInnis
Tucker
Velazquez
Waldholtz
Wilson

□ 1728

Messrs. NEAL of Massachusetts, JEFFERSON, and TOWNS changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Ms. ESHOO, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. YATES changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNITED STATES TROOP DEPLOYMENTS IN BOSNIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the first section of House Resolution 304, it is now in order to debate the subject of the deployment of Armed Forces in Bosnia.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

□ 1730

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we have come to this point in our debate over United States policy on Bosnia because the Clinton administration has resolutely declined to provide the necessary leadership.

In this campaign for President, Mr. Clinton stated that he favored using military force, if necessary, to ensure that food and other relief supplies could reach the desperate people of Bosnia. After his election in November 1992, President Clinton followed the lead of the United Nations and our European allies.

During that period, a number of us in the Congress sought to ease the suffering of the Bosnian Moslems by repealing the arms embargo that put them at such a terrible disadvantage.

Our legislation would have permitted the equipping and training of the Bosnians so that they could defend themselves.

The Government of Bosnia pleaded with our Government to do just that, to lift the immoral arms embargo the United Nations imposed with our Government's support.

In meetings with the President, again and again we strongly urged lifting the arms embargo, but the President did not act because our NATO allies opposed it.

The best we could obtain was enactment of legislation late last year that required our Nation to stop enforcing the embargo against other countries.

Had the arms embargo been lifted, we would not now be confronted with sending our troops to enforce a peace plan that raises more questions than it has answered.

Hundreds of our troops are now in Bosnia even as we speak. Thousands more will soon follow. Short of passing a law to cut off funds—which the Senate has declined to do—and which the President would veto anyway—we cannot prevent this deployment.

The administration has yet to convince the American people that we have a vital national interest in Bosnia that warrants the possible sacrifice of American lives there.

The American people have registered their overwhelming opposition to sending our forces on a mission whose purposes remain murky, and whose outcome is uncertain.

As the House debates the measures before it today, we must consider how to balance our opposition to the policy of deploying our forces to Bosnia with our support for the men and women who are being ordered into a real-life Mission Impossible.

In his speech to the Nation, the President stated that providing more than 20,000 American ground troops for the NATO implementation force is vital for the Bosnian peace plan to succeed.

The President stated that our mission would have realistic goals achievable in a definite period of time—1 year.

While the President has specified a time frame, he has not spelled out the criteria for success, or our options if those criteria are not met. There is an exit date, but no exit strategy.

The peace plan is complex and complicated. It states that our main military task will be to separate the warring factions from the lines of confrontation, and keep them behind boundaries that will partition Bosnia into two entities. If the factions do not comply, our troops are authorized to forcibly remove them. How does this differ from fighting a war, which the President has assured us is not our objective?

Justice Richard Goldstone, the Chief Prosecutor of the War Crimes Tribunal, has told us that there can be no peace in Bosnia without justice for the victims of war crimes.

The peace plan describes an elaborate framework for investigating and assigning responsibility for human rights abuses, but is silent on how its findings will be enforced. Will our troops be called upon to bring the guilty to justice? If not, who will?

The President has argued that failure to keep his commitment to send troops to Bosnia will undermine future United States leadership and NATO's credibility.

But what will happen if, when the year is up and the President prepares to withdraw our troops, our NATO allies object, saying that the mission is incomplete? Do we stay, or go anyway?

Mr. Speaker, the votes we cast today will long be remembered in the history books of our Nation. Our votes must reflect our best judgments of the risks that this mission entails, of the soundness of the policy behind it, the potential for success and the price of failure.

How many Members of Congress who voted for the Tonkin Gulf resolution in 1964 have since said that was the one vote they wished they could take back?

Mr. Speaker, let us hope that, in the months ahead, our colleagues do not say that they wish they could have back any of the votes they cast on this issue today.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 7 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this is an important debate for the House today. Putting American troops in harm's way is as serious a decision as government makes. It is a decision that should be made not only by the President, but also by the Congress, so it is good that we are having the debate.

I should say at the outset that my preference is that the House vote today to support the U.S. troops and the mission in Bosnia. I think that kind of a decision should be a collective judgment of the Congress and the President; and when the Congress shares responsibility, the decision is stronger, sounder, and better able to withstand the shifting political winds and circumstance.

Let me state, as briefly as I can, why I think the deployment of troops to Bosnia is worthwhile. First, I think it is quite clear that the United States participation is essential to peace. All of the parties here, the Muslims, the Croats, the Serbs, and so far as I know all the countries in the world, none in opposition, agree that without American leadership, there would be no peace agreement; that without American troop participation, the peace agreement would simply fall apart; and that without U.S. involvement, the killing would resume and the war risks spread.

I also think that U.S. interests are very much at stake here. The question of Bosnia is now bigger than Bosnia. It has become a key test of American leadership, and having brokered the peace agreement, we cannot walk away. Bosnia is a test of U.S. leadership in the world. If we do not go in, our credibility sinks and our reliability collapses.

This Dayton agreement is not perfect. Some say it is not just. But the president of Bosnia has it right: This peace agreement is more just than a continuation of the war, peace is better than more war.

Mr. Speaker, this agreement supports U.S. interests in many ways. it stops the killing, it maintains a single unitary Bosnia state, it protects human rights, it reunifies Sarajevo, it allows refugees to return, it obligates the parties to participate and cooperate fully with the War Crimes Tribunal, it certainly avoids more war, it strengthens and preserves NATO and maintains U.S. leadership in NATO.

I believe the mission is doable. The mission for IFOR will be limited with a clearly states military task. The mission will be NATO-led, operating under clear, unified command and control with robust rules of engagement. heavily armed, well-trained U.S. troops will take their orders from an American general who commands NATO. Its mission is limited and targeted.

The purpose of this limited military mission is to establish a stable and secure environment so that others, not IFOR, can do the important tasks of reconstruction and reconciliation.

It is important to recognize what the mission is not, and there must be no mission creep. Our troops must not deliver humanitarian assistance, they must not serve as a nation-building force, they must not be a police force, they must not be responsible for election security. Those are all important and even critical tasks, but they will be performed by the civilian component of the peace process, and the Europeans will play the leading role there and pick up most of the costs.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the risks here are shared and acceptable. There is not any doubt that the U.S. troops will face risks, but those risks are acceptable and the mission can be achieved.

The costs and risks of failing to act are far greater: war instead of peace, not only in Bosnia but possibly in Europe, a crippled NATO alliance, and the United States not leading but staying on the sidelines.

We do not bear these risks alone. We share these risks with our closest NATO allies. We supply one-third of the troops. NATO and other countries provide the other two-thirds. I believe that there is no real alternative that has been enunciated by the opponents of the President's policy.

□ 1745

Mr. HAMILTON. So far as I can determine, those who oppose the present policy simply do not have an alternative. What would they have us do? how would they maintain U.S. leadership, U.S. credibility, and U.S. reliability? How would they stop the fighting? How would they aid the injured? How would they create stability? How old they provide hope?

I believe, in this situation, that the United States can make a difference. Americans are understandably conflicted about this mission, and they have every right to be skeptical and to demand answers to their concerns. They do not want the United States to become the world's policeman, and there are many conflict in the world where we are not involved. But where we can make a difference for peace, where our action can stop a war, where our action can stop the killing, where the costs and the risks are manageable, we should act.

Finally, the United States, and this may be the most important point of all, must remain, in the conduct of its American foreign policy, reliable and credible. When we come right down to it, foreign policy is all about reliability. The United States will only be taken seriously in the world if we are seen as reliable; if we are viewed as standing up to our commitments in Bosnia or elsewhere. If the United States does not participate in IFOR, the United States will not taken seriously, its standing in the world is weakened. The consequence then of not voting to support the policy in Bosnia is, in my view, to undermine U.S. security because we undermine the reliability and the credibility of U.S. foreign policy.

No one knows whether this effort will succeed. no one is satisfied with all aspects of the Dayton agreement. There are no guarantees. But I urge the Members to support the policy and, of course, to support the troops.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABCHER] a member of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. I respectfully disagree with the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON]. We have advocated an alternative to this policy for years. We have had a policy in the United States of an arms embargo against the victims of aggression for all of these years. The years go on and on, and yet the architects of that failed policy, which brought genocide, which brought mass killings, which brought aggression, now those architects of that failed policy tell us we have to send our young people into the Balkans, and we have not had an alternative.

We have been advocating an alternative all along. The fact is the architects of that failed policy now want to deploy tens of thousands of young Americans into the bloody Balkans when they helped make the bloody Balkans, and they want to put then right in the heart of the conflict.

I will be supporting the Dornan bill, which is the only binding legislation that we have to choose from of the three bills that we will choose from today. The other bills, just for the public knowledge, are show bills. They will give Members a chance for cover. The bill offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] is the only that will stop a deployment, if indeed, it was enacted into law.

I will have to let my fellow Members know what that means. The House of Representatives should understand that the vote that we will take that is going to take place will be characterized by the President, if the Dornan bill goes down, as support of his deployment of Americans into the Balkans. That is what he has done with the vote in the Senate.

When the Senate voted down the Hefley bill today, the White House said, ''That was probably the strongest statement of support they could possibly make. Having voted overwhelmingly not to shut off funding, is in a

sense supporting the President's judgement.''

If my colleagues want it on their record that they voted for the Gulf of Tonkin resolution of the Balkans, go right ahead and vote against the bill offered by the gentleman from California. We do not want to send our young people into that meat grinder that has absolutely no goals in mind, just to have an American presence. That is insane.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. CLEMENT].

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, in a very uplifting and inspiring address, Prime Minister Peres of Israel characterized the 20th century as the American Century. As the end of the 20th century approaches, Americans can look back and feel proud of what we have accomplished in the past 96 years. The United States has compiled a list of foreign policy successes which is unrivaled in the modern world, including squelching the threats of nazism and communism, and the recent strides made toward lasting peace in the Middle East, South Africa, and Northern Ireland. All of these successes share the same values—American values—on which this great country was built: freedom and democracy. Yes, this truly is the American Century.

Now, the United States has been called on again, not to make war, but to make peace. Peace in a place where many felt it would never be achieved. We have all seen the atrocities on television, the rapes and murders of innocent civilians. After 3½ years, the fighting in Bosnia has left 250,000 people dead and 2 million more homeless. Yet here we are, on the verge of a unilateral peace agreement in war-torn Bosnia which will be formally signed tomorrow in Paris. We should be proud as Americans that our country's leadership has made this settlement possible. Now that the leaders of Bosnia, Croatia, and Serbia have reached agreement on the principles of freedom and democracy, it is up to the United States to take the next step, and following through with our commitment to help enforce these peace provisions. Let us all pray that this peace agreement will be kept by all parties.

The political upheaval of the former Soviet Union has left the United States, and its democratic foundation, in a position of world leadership. We are the last superpower. With this leadership comes responsibilities, and helping to ensure the stability of Europe.

I find it reprehensible that when the drawn of peace in Central Europe is upon us and our troops are already risking their lives to forge out this peace in Bosnia's hilly and dangerous terrain, some of my colleagues wish to cut off funding to the American troops.

Congress has the opportunity to do the right thing. Support the President, support the troops, support American values, and support peace in Bosnia. My colleagues, it is time to give peace a chance. The American Century is far from over.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Kansas [Mrs. MEYERS].

(Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express strong concern about sending U.S. troops to Bosnia and in support of the Dornan amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I have said that I would not object to sending troops to Bosnia if we had a really rock-solid peace agreement, but we do not have a rock-solid peace agreement.

President Tudjman has signed for Croatia, but he had an agenda. They got Slavonia back. President Milosevic has signed for Serbia, but he also had an agenda. He wanted to end the embargo. The only one who has signed for Bosnia is President Izetbegovic. No one has spoken for the Bosnian Serbs; no one for the Bosnian Croats. I think that, in fact, Mladic has spoken against this agreement on behalf of the Bosnian Serbs.

The argument about not abandoning the troops in the field I think is just not valid. The troops are not there yet. We have maybe 100 troops in Tuzla. By this time 6 months from now, we will have thousands there. Now is the time to speak.

Mr. Speaker, this war and the Vietnam war were very different, but in some ways, in one way at least, they are very similar. Do we never learn anything? We found out in Vietnam that we cannot and we should not fight a war that the American people do not support. I do not think that that support is here.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I think we should look at what will we accomplish? I firmly believe that if we leave in a year, and I say if we leave in a year, the fighting will not only resume, but will be much more violent, because all the parties will have had a year to rearm and to develop supplies.

Mr. Speaker, I support the Dornan amendment.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. FARR].

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, the debate here today is not about sending troops to Bosnia. Our troops are in Bosnia, and tomorrow more will go, and Friday even more will go. In fact, yesterday afternoon I was with many of my colleagues having lunch with those troops in Frankfurt, Germany, and what they asked is for us to support what they are doing.

Mr. Speaker, those troops are trained. They are prepared to go. They are eager to go. In fact, the ones I had lunch with said, ''I want to do the job that I am trained for.''

This debate here tonight is not about war in Bosnia. It is a debate about whether Americans will stand up to implement a peace plan—a peace plan that we led. The agreement was written in Dayton. This agreement is one of the most interesting contracts ever done in the modern world. It sets out a whole process for how the military aspects will be involved in the peace settlement; how to stabilize the region; how to enter into boundary disputes; how to prepare for elections; a new constitution is written.

It sets up a system of arbitration of differences and sets up a commission for human rights and petitioning that commission. It is how to deal with refugees and displaced persons, including just compensation for taken property. It sets up a commission to preserve the national monuments and sets up public corporations for Bosnia and Herzegovina.

It sets up a civilian implementation plan to transfer from war to civil governments; it sets up an international policy for police task forces.

Mr. Speaker, this is an agreement that is signed by all the leaders. This is a contract on how we get from here to there. And when it is over, we stabilize the Balkans. Sure, there is some risk. But we are in a world where leadership is about getting something done, and the United States has gotten something done. We have ended the war; peace has broken out.

Mr. Speaker, to walk away from this would be a travesty. All the generals that we talked to, and the admirals that are going to be involved in this, urged our delegation to support the troops. As Admiral Snuffy Smith, who is going to be in command, told us, ''I'll tell you why I want you to support us. Because we're big, we're good, and we deliver. We'll get in, we'll get the job done, and we'll get out.''

Twenty-eight nations are already involved in the IFOR process. It would be a travesty for our military to walk away from all of those other troops whose mothers and fathers are just as concerned as our mothers and fathers about their sons and daughters serving there.

Mr. Speaker, it would be a travesty for diplomacy. Every ambassador that we talked to said this is the right thing. This peace accord is amazing. It is a great document. We ought to be supporting.

Last, the Presidents whose countries are involved, whose citizens suffered the war, all stated, ''We signed this document. We are going to implement it. We want it to work. We are sick and tired of war. We do not want it to continue. We want to be back in the nation of economic prosperity. We have the talent to do that. Give us the chance.''

Let peace prevail. Support our troops. Reject the Dornan amendment.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I have one North Star that my eyes are going to be fixed on during the next 3 hours, and that is what I will say to a young

widow or Gold Star Mother or some young child who has lost their dad or their mom for the rest of their life.

There has been a lot of confusion around here in the last couple of hours. It appears that Clinton is on his way to Europe again. The plane takes off in about a minute from Andrews. He is going to be calling the Democratic cloakroom, or somewhere, regularly to see if this House is going to give him the power that he took unconstitutionally, without coming to the Senate or the U.S. House of Representatives for permission to do this.

I remember when the Vietnam war went down the tubes and the fight transferred from the jungles and the fields and the central highlands of Vietnam to the Halls of this Congress. I remember when liberal Democrats were on this floor saying that Johnson, and then Nixon, did not have the constitutional power to absorb 300 and 400 killed in action every week.

□ 1800

Every time I though they are half right, I was suppressed by loyal Americans saying you must support the men in the field. The last speaker talked about the enthusiasm of our young men and now women who want to do the job they were trained to do.

How many people are left in this House who talked to the 18,000 Vietnamese-speaking Green Berets who John F. Kennedy sent to Vietnam in 1963, 1964 and 1965? They were over there because of his orders in 1961 and 1962. How many thought that they should be allowed to do the job then? Talk to some of the fighter pilots here like the gentleman from California, DUKE CUNNINGHAM, the gentleman from Texas SAM JOHNSON, and the gentleman from Florida, PETE PETERSON, on this side. Ask how they were not allowed to hit serious targets in Vietnam and paid for it with years out of their life and their friends dead.

This is going to be, as the man in the Speaker's chair said today, at the Republican conference the most important vote of 1995, maybe 1995–1996. Clinton does not have the constitutional authority to do this. We have not even properly debated the constitutionality of it, let alone the weather report that I am looking at at Tuzla, which is sickening to put our men in there. Ninety-seven people are on the ground only right now.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS], distinguished dean of the Florida delegation.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I have learned a few things in life. ONe of the things that sticks out I guess in all of our minds is that anything that is worth doing is not without risk, and certainly this mission is not without risk. but after long consideration, I rise to support the Hamilton resolution, support the mission and support the troops that are involved.

I was here on the House floor and voted for the Gulf of Tonkin resolution. This is not a Gulf of Tonkin resolution. The Gulf of Tonkin resolution was a thinly disguished declaration of war against the Vietnamese forces. We go this time to keep peace, not to make war. There is a plan. There is a large support from the nations of the world to support this plan. There is acquiescence by the leaders of the combatants involved. Nothing that we do is without risk. We are going to have some casualties, for which we will all feel very sorry. But we cannot sit here or stand here idly and not do anything. Too much is at stake.

I often think that World War II could have been avoided had there just been any resolve on the organized world community to resist the aggression that took place in the guise of Hitler and Mussolini and Tojo. In the beginning, we could have said no, if we had had the physical ability or the will to do it, but we did not and the world did not. That conflagration, that combat grew and grew and grew.

I do not know that what we are doing here today is similar, but if we fail to act, the fault will be on our part. There is a time in which civilized people must act and must act together and must act in accordance with a plan. This is the best plan that we have come up with. I think it is time that we go ahead with it, facing the risk of facing the challenges that are there and be resolved to support our troops and to take whatever action is necessary in bringing about peace in that area of the world. If we do not, the fault will be on us. If we do, there will be plenty of other people to help claim whatever victory there is in all of this. But we must move. We must move together and we must move resolutely. Let us support our armed forces.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BATEMAN].

(Mr. BATEMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BATEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, like the gentleman from Tennessee, I was terribly moved yesterday as Prime Minister Peres extolled the United States of America for what it means to the entire world community. We all stood and applauded the eloquence, even though maybe that was self-serving, because he was talking about us.

This country, after having deferred to our European allies for 1991 until into this year, finally became fully engaged. Because it became engaged, our NATO Forces commenced their strikes against the Bosnian Serbs.

Following that, there was a cease-fire and, following that, an agreement that the leaders of the warring factions would come to this country to try and work out a negotiated peace. None of that would have happened but for American leadership. There is no substitute for American leadership.

Having brought about a cease-fire, now having brought about an agreement under our sponsorship, based upon a commitment that our forces would be committed, we make a terrible error if we now renege on that commitment. There are things about the commitment, the degree of the commitment and blemishes in the commitment that I think are unfortunate. But the bedrock of the matter is that we stand committed. If we renege upon it, our vital national security interests will be very materially and significantly adversely affected.

We are the sole remaining world power, and we cannot be engaged militarily certainly anywhere and everywhere where there is strife in this world. But certainly if, having given this commitment, we renege upon it, say goodbye to the NATO alliance. Others may tell you otherwise, but I have no doubt that what it will, cripple it. Say goodbye to America playing a role and being credible in all of the far-flung corners of the globe, where the United States can make a difference in terms of promoting stability and peace, which are in our national security interests.

I must oppose the Dornan resolution.

There is not and has not been a substantial question as to whether America has a role to play in seeking a peaceful conclusion to the war in Bosnia. It is an immutable fact of history that our country is the world's premier superpower. We did not seek that role; it has devolved upon us as a by-product of history in this century.

The international activism of President Theodore Roosevelt, followed by our being compelled to enter World War I to facilitate the triumph over the forces of aggression and totalitarianism, had consequences. We were right recognized as a major would power.

Unfortunately, after World War I, we withdrew from the world stage. We refused to participate in the League of Nations despite the fact that it was our creation. We stood by and watched Fascism come to power in Italy and Germany. We offered no meaningful opposition to Hitler as he marched into the Rhineland or to Mussolini as he attacked Ethiopia and marched into Croatia. We offered no resistance to Hitler's dismemberment of Czechoslovakia or to the invasion of Poland, which ultimately lead England and France to belatedly challenge Nazi Germany after it had rearmed.

Only after the treacherous attack on Pearl Harbor did we enter World War II and again make possible the defeat of aggressive and repressive totalitarianism. Based on the disastrous agreement struck with Stalin at Yalta, we saw all the Balkan, Eastern Europe and Baltic states come under the yoke of communism and an iron curtain descend across Europe. We committed ourselves to helping Greece and Turkey from falling prey to communism. We initiated the Marshall Plan to save Western Europe from sinking into economic collapse and communist influence. We negotiated the North Atlantic Treaty Organization [NATO] as a bulwark against the expansion of the Soviet Union. In 1950, we led a United Nations' effort to defeat the conquest of South Korea by the North Korean communists.

It could be argued that we could—or should—have remained disengaged from

these situations because they were not our problems. Fortunately, we did not. Soviet influence was contained after a struggle of more than 40 years. We led the free world in defeating Soviet imperial designs and the nations of Eastern Europe were freed of Communist regimes accountable to Moscow. This is an incredible record; one every American should reflect on with pride.

There is no disputing that the historic events of this century have conferred upon the United States a status that is significant and unavoidable. We are the superpower. what our country thinks, the position it takes, and how it acts are vitally important factors in every area of the globe. Only a fully engaged United States could have put together the grand coalition that defeated Iraq in the Gulf War, when Sadaam Hussein's aggression threatened our security interests. No one can conclude that this aggression would have been resolved without American leadership.

The break-up of powerful empires has throughout history been attended by political and economic instability, which is anathema to democratic governments and inimical to the maintenance of peace. Surely, few would argue that we have no interest in encouraging democracy and peace. The absence of either runs counter to our moral view and, as history has shown in certain areas—as in Europe—contrary to our national security interest.

None of this argues that we are the world's policeman, or should conduct ourself as an international busybody. We should, however, be engaged where our influence serves a constructive purpose in spreading or supporting democracy, even if no American military or economic commitment is contemplated or appropriate. Against this background, I approach the question of what is the role of this country in the Balkans and in seeking to end the war in Bosnia and Herzegovenia. Due to the troubled history of this region through the centuries, and the nature of the ethnic, religious, and nationalistic forces at play there, the peace of Europe has not only been threatened but conflict has occurred.

When the former Yugoslavia broke up in 1991, the United States remained largely detached and chose to defer to its European allies to deal with the problem. This was an understandable view, but events have proven it unrealistic. Without the United States taking an active part, there exists a deficiency in leadership adequate to bring about an end to the war in Bosnia and to discourage its spread. NATO allies deployed thousands of troops on the ground and sustained a number of casualties, but the troops and their diplomacy failed to produce a comprehensive peace agreement.

With Americans successfully insisting upon NATO air strikes against the Bosnia Serbs, and Croatian-Bosnian Moslem successes, the warring parties were induced by U.S. diplomacy to come to the bargaining table. But for the stature of the United States, this would not have happened, and vital to it happening was a commitment that the United States would play a part in the peacekeeping forces that would be put in place following the signing of a peace agreement. That such an agreement has been concluded is a triumph of American diplomacy and a tribute to this country's standing as a force for good, for peace and for democracy. How can we bring the parties to the bargaining table based on a commitment of our involvement, induce them to agree to peace, and then walk away from that commitment?

If we refuse to honor the commitment, it will have consequences. These consequences would be significant and would affect our vital national security interest. If we falter, it would have deleterious implications for our most important national security relationship: the NATO alliance. It would be a low blow from which the alliance could likely never recover. That presents a clear and vital national security concern for this country.

Should we shrink from our proper role in implementing the peace agreement negotiated under and as a result of our sponsorship, this country will have lost not face, but credibility throughout the world. It would have an impact in this hemisphere, throughout Europe, Asia and the Middle East—in short, everywhere. A superpower sought as a force for stability and peace that chooses to disengage, especially when it made a commitment to be involved, defaults as a leader. Such a default creates a vacuum of power no other nation is capable of filling. Such a circumstance is the basis from which instability and conflict are born and this defeats our vital national interests.

We have supported expansion of NATO over the reluctance of some of our NATO allies. If we refuse to lead in implementing the peace agreement we procured our policy of expanding NATO will be nullified. NATO could well contract, not expand. Resumption of the conflict between Bosnian Serbs, Bosnian Muslims and Croats will not necessarily lead to expansion of conflicts throughout the Balkans, but if it resumes because the United States refuses to play it proper role, the risk of new and wider conflict in the Balkans increases. A signal that we are not concerned and are unwilling to take some risk for peace is a signal that we would not regard conflict between Albanian, Macedonian, Bulgarian, Greek, or Turkish ethnic, religious, or nationalistic elements as adversely affecting our national interest. To send such a signal would be a tragic mistake, for there are those who would certainly receive that signal and become more inclined to act upon it.

I repeat, the issue should not be whether there is an important role we need and should play in bringing peace to Bosnia and Herzogovenia. We do, we should, we must play our proper role. President Clinton deserves recognition for ultimately becoming engaged and for using our unique standing to bring the warring parties to the negotiating table. He was right to do so. In fact, it should have been done earlier. President Clinton was correct to signal that, if a peace agreement was reached, we would play a role in seeing it implemented.

To have specified a commitment of 20,000 to 25,000 American ground forces, even before the military mission and the size of the total force could be determined, however, was a ridiculous mistake. We will undoubtedly have a very heavy responsibility for the air and sealift for the peace implementation force. We will provide the medical care, command and control, most of the intelligence function and the combat air support. This being the case, there should have been no need for us to comprise a third or more of the ground forces. This is a disproportionate burden for us, measured by what our NATO and other allies can and should be expected to do. The President should be seeking to reduce the burden we accepted to a more equitable level.

American and the other forces deployed to implement the peace agreement must be perceived and in fact be neutral, not protagonists of one or the other of the warring parties. To be viewed as favoring one side risks the permanence of the peace and enhances the risk of casualties for the American forces.

There are provisions of the Dayton peace agreement that wisely impose a moratorium for a period of months on the acquisition of arms by the formerly warring parties. It properly calls for negotiation of a disarmament regime to bring the conflicting parties to a state of parity in aggregate military capability, which should serve to deter renewal of the conflict. This is eminently sound, and we must exert intense diplomatic influences to promote military parity through disarmament. If the effort succeeds, there would be no need for us to arm and train the Muslims unless it was done within the framework of such an agreement. If the disarmament effort does not succeed, the Dayton agreement, by its items, provides that after 180 days there should be an agreed self-executing military parity between the parties using as a baseline the military resources of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. Based on the terms of the agreement, the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia would be permitted 75 percent of the baseline, with the Republic of Croatia and the Republic of Bosnia and Herzogovenia each allocated 30 percent of the baseline.

If we make it clear that we will not provide arms to any faction except under the specific condition that it is done to provide and protect the military parity to which the parties have agreed, we can preserve the mutual, even-handed posture our role as a peacekeeper requires. The earlier the President spells it out, the less likely any role we ultimately undertake to arm and train Muslim forces will be perceived as constituting a hostile presence by the other parties.

Our NATO allies have opposed arming the Bosnian Muslims. Should the United States proceed to do so while there is an ongoing NATO deployment, and without the concurrence of the North Atlantic Council, it would threaten alliance solidarity. This would place us on a slippery slope we would do well to avoid. If we do as I suggest it should be acceptable to our NATO allies because our actions would be consistent with the Dayton agreement that they have endorsed.

I oppose any American forces being deployed to implement the peace agreement negotiated in Dayton until or unless it has been formally accepted by all the parties. Our role is not to make peace when the parties wish to continue the conflict. Our mission is to implement and help build mutual confidence among former warring factions who purport to want and have agreed to peace. If those parties by their conduct cast doubt upon whether they indeed desire the peace they ask us to implement, we should not put our forces in harm's way.

The agreement initialed in Dayton spells out a number of specific measures the warring parties pledged to implement within a specified period of time. Those measures include the departure of foreign forces such as the Islamic fundamentalists, whose presence is a threat to NATO troops. The warring parties also agreed to comply with the October 5,

1995, ceasefire and to refrain from all offensive operations of any kind, to disarm and disband all armed civilian groups and to avoid committing reprisals or counterattacks in response to violations of the agreement. The parties committed to begin promptly and proceed steadily to withdraw all forces behind a zone of separation. The parties are to account for all prisoners and to release them no later than 30 days after the date of the ''transfer of authority,'' which is the date on which the U.N. commander transfers authority to the Implementation Force [I–FOR] commander.

The I–FOR implementation of the military aspects of the agreement should be delayed until the warring parties have demonstrated their willingness to discharge the obligations spelled out in Dayton by their leaders. If this is not done it will signify that they do not accept and will not comply with the reasonable measures required of them. In that event there will be no peace to implement and I–FOR, from the outset, would be injected into a combat mission.

The Clinton administration is insisting that our deployment of forces in Bosnia will last approximately 1 year. That is not an exit strategy, only a more or less arbitrary date. I am sympathetic to the declaration of a date for the withdrawal of American military forces from Bosnia, and it should be understood that if the need exists for a continued deployment beyond 1 year that the forces that remain will be comprised from contingents supplied from other nations. While establishment of fixed dates to conclude operations is generally ill-advised, a 1-year deadline for participation of American forces should be sufficient to ensure that the conditions in Bosnia are stabilized to the extent that any continued deployment could be sustained by non-United States forces.

As I have said, we do have a role to play in bringing peace to Bosnia. In 1 year we will have fairly and fully played that role and will have created conditions where non-U.S. forces should be fully adequate. The President should immediately communicate this position to our allies.

Our commitment of ground forces is based upon more than the initialing of words on a piece of paper. It is predicated upon the premise that the warring parties truly desire peace and will comply with the actions they have pledged to take. If they do not, the conditions for our commitment of forces will not have been met and U.S. personnel should not be deployed. In this context, the recent repudiation of the Dayton agreement by Bosnian Serb military leaders and the statements of French Gen. Jean-Rene Bachelet are particularly worrisome. Before we proceed with the deployment of our personnel, we should insist on assurances through confidence-building measures that the Bosnian Serbs want peace and under the terms of the Dayton agreement.

The securing of peace in Bosnia and stability in the Balkans is a noble objective that serves American interests and justifies our accepting some measured risk of casualties. Every drop of blood of American military personnel is precious, yet to shrink from our forces being engaged because there might be some casualties argues for doing away with our military. An American policy that shrinks from honoring commitments because there might be casualties is an invitation to future disaster. Our national interests throughout the globe would be imperiled if we prove unwilling to honor a major commitment.

If we are steadfast, we reenforce freedom, decency and stability throughout the world. To be otherwise would lead to instability and upheaval in many areas that are important to our Nation's peace and security.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Connecticut, [Ms. DELAURO] with whom I visited Bosnia this past weekend.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I stand in support of American troops and in support of the United States mission in Bosnia.

The debate we have here today is as much about America's future as it is about Bosnia. Our vote today will send a message about our country's future role in NATO. If we walk away today, we will have relinquished our leadership role in the international community.

The human tragedy in Bosnia is beyond description. A quarter of a million people have been killed in 3 years of senseless slaughter. If we fail to enforce the Dayton peace agreement, we turn our backs on those who have suffered from mass rape, ethnic cleansing, and other unspeakable horrors.

In the face of this moral crisis, we must be willing to step forward and lead. It is what great nations such as ours have always done. Moral leadership in the world is part of the price of being the world's sole superpower.

Over the weekend, I joined a factfinding trip to Bosnia. I admit that I went with strong reservations about our military mission there, but I have returned with the knowledge that our troops are ready and our mission is clear. I have also returned with a belief that we have a moral obligation to do what only a U.S.-led force can do: keep the peace.

One of the highlights of our trip was a stopover in Germany to visit with American troops who will be deployed in the coming weeks. While there, I had a chance to speak with a young soldier from New London, CT, Private Jarion Clarke. Private Clark told me that he is well-trained, has faith in his leaders, and believes in the United States mission in Bosnia.

I asked Private Clarke what I could do for him: ''Tell the American people that we are ready and we need their support,'' he said. So, that is the message I bring. Our soldiers need our support. They deserve our support.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the Dornan, and Buyer resolution. Vote for the Hamilton resolution. The only measure that clearly says to American men and women in uniform is that we stand behind them.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GANSKE].

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Speaker, I too, just returned from Bosnia. Let me summarize what I learned.

First, no one in the Balkans wants to be part of a minority. Minorities get raped and killed. This fact caused the refugee problem. My impression is that there is a difference in commitment by the signers of the treaty on how to handle these refugees. One party wants them to return to their homes and villages. The other argues that this will recreate the conditions that led to the conflict in the first place. They argue for humanitarian aid to resettle these refugees in safer places. This is a crucial difference that bears on the long-term chances for success and peace.

Second, there is clearly unhappiness with the territorial provisions of the accord by both the Bosnians and the Serbs. The Bosnian Serbs feel they were betrayed, and the Bosnian Moslems do not like the territorial provisions either. They only signed on with the condition that the United States arm and train them.

This brings us to the third major area of disagreement, the level of rearming of the Bosnian Serbs. There were reports in the press indicating that the Bosnian Moslems want training for 18 brigades and want to be supplied with 200 tanks and 200 armed vehicles. Mr. Milosevic on the other hand thinks that all parties should proportionally downsize. This difference of interpretation of the treaty does not bode well for long-term peace.

Mr. Speaker, the technical requirements of the plan are contradictory. Will our troops be policemen or not? Nation builders or not? I asked a senior military official what would happen if in his sector the Bosnians or the Serbs started to harass a civilian population, would he respond or not. He said, why yes. Well, if he does, then he has now taken sides. We now have the U.S. military in a civil war.

Mr. Speaker, there is an alternative. Lift the arms embargo, provide relief aid, provide the same air support, the same logistical support. It is not too late. The best answer is Dornan.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4½ minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this past weekend I was fortunate to lead, with Congressman DENNIS HASTERT of Illinois, a CODEL which visited Italy, Croatia, Bosnia, Serbia, and Germany. We met with the President of Croatia, the Prime Minister of Bosnia, the President of Serbia, IFOR commanders, and U.S. troops who were preparing for deployment. The CODEL sought to answer six questions: What is the United States stake in Bosnia? Can the IFOR mission be accomplished? Are there risks to our troops? How do you separate military from civilian responsibilities? How do you measure the success of the missions, and what happens if they are not working? What should be done to maximize IFOR's success?

Adm. Leighton Smith, commander of the American forces south, and the other American generals and officers who briefed the CODEL were confident that the IFOR mission is achievable because IFOR has a clear mandate, substantial firepower, and the desire of the

parties involved to settle this conflict. Each head of government with whom we met also expressed confidence that the Dayton signatories would meet their obligations because, as President Tudjman said, ''Without the direct involvement of the United States, peace in Bosnia is not possible.

Implementation of the Dayton agreement is necessary and only the United States and NATO can do it.

There are risks. The roads are poor and the danger of accidents is high. Snipers, car bombs, land mines, and mortar fire are all potential threats. The presence of an unknown number of Mujahedeen fighters may be a problem, especially if they decide they do not want to leave Bosnia.

Clearly, there are many unknowns. Neither the U.S. Congress, our military leaders, our NATO allies, or the signatories to the Dayton agreement can promise that our involvement is without risk. But we do know that the Dayton signatories. both the politicians and the people they represent said they want peace. And they believe that peace and stability can be reached only with our assistance. As Prime Minister Silajdzic of Bosnia said, ''This move by your President is a courageous move, a farreaching move. It is extremely important to grasp this change for peace. Because if Dayton doesn't work nothing will work. We cannot have peace without a stable buffer, a bridge. That is why we need NATO troops. No other organization can do it. We need your help to make pace, not war.''

Mr. Speaker, this debate is as much about our role in the world as it is about our role in this conflict. Today we are deciding how involved we want to be in shaping the world around us. In the past 72 hours two persons have put our role into perspective for me. The first was Admiral Smith. When asked about the United States national interest in Bosnia, he replied that the wrong questions was being posed. He stated: ''The question is about U.S. leadership in the world. If we don't go in our credibility goes to rock bottom. The next time when vital U.S. interests are engaged, are our allies and friends going to be with us? Probably not.''

The second person was Israeli Prime Minister Shimon Peres, during his address to the joint session of Congress, when he said that the United States has ''. . . save[d] the globe from three of its greatest menaces: nazi tyranny, Japanese militarism and the communist challenge.'' When he spoke of Palestinian democracy and peace with Israel's enemies, he said ''three years ago such a prospect would have been a fantasy. All of this would not be attainable were it not for the American involvement and support for our efforts.''

Mr. Speaker, every person voting in this Chamber today must decide right now what kind of world he or she wants to live in. We are clearly the most powerful country in the world. We have a strong military, a stable government, robust civil rights, and a reputation for constantly recreating ourselves to make America a better, more equitable country. And it is because of our vibrant, democratic traditions that the rest of the world looks to us for leadership. We talk a good game in this body, passing resolutions to say this and sense of Congress' to say that, but if we do not support our good intentions with actions, then our words will lose meaning and our good intentions and strong words will be a joke worldwide.

I, for one, believe in American leadership and I believe, as one of the American generals said to me, that the people of Bosnia, Serbia, and Croatia, need a period of decency. I want to give them that period of decency by helping to secure their peace.

□ 1815

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], chairman of our Committee on Appropriations.

(Mr. LIVINGSTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I also was in Bosnia last weekend, and I met some of the troops that are going to carry out this plan. I had my picture taken with them, and I got a medal from them, from the First Armored Division. They are good people, and they deserve our support.

They were sent by the President to work with NATO to separate warring parties and hopefully keep those people from killing one another.

Now those parties have gone to Dayton, and they have signed a peace accord, and that accord says that our troops are there to assure the peace, not to make war, not to rebuild Bosnia, not to aid refugees, not to remove mines, not to disarm the parties, not to arm or train the Muslims. They are there to keep the peace, and they are well-trained, and well-equipped. They are prepared for the mission, and they will shoot to defend themselves, if necessary.

But hopefully they will not have to.

Now, I have opposed the circumstances which have brought us to this point. I cannot change history however. The Commander in Chief of our armed forces has deployed our troops in what he says is in our national interest, and at this point I can only repeat what the local commander of our forces told me as recently as this Monday. He said, ''Don't let the Congress do anything which sends a message to these kids that you in Congress aren't in full support of their efforts.'' Mr. Speaker, I intend to follow his advice, and I intend to support our troops in and out of Bosnia.

Mr. Speaker, I will vote for the buyer resolution, I will vote for the Hamilton resolution, and I will give our troops the resources that they need to do their job and come home.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to another Floridian, Mr. PETERSON, a distinguished veteran who, I might add, had a very significant hand in allowing that the fighter pilots from France were released.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, we have a peace treaty. We did not sign it, we did not initial it, but the combatants in the war in Bosnia, all three, did.

This is an unusual opportunity for America. We have always had the opportunity to risk war, and we have done so every time that there was any national interest at stake. We have done that willingly, we have done that as a governmental body, we have done that as a nation.

What a wonderful opportunity to have today. We can risk peace. Yes, we can risk peace.

What happens if we fail? What happens if we fail in our effort to seek peace? We have war.

This is a no-brainer to me. Never have I in my career had the opportunity to go for peace. Our troops are going to Bosnia to implement a peaceful settlement that all three of the combatants have agreed to.

No one, I do not think can say that anything that happens in Europe is not of interest to us. The cost of being a superpower is that virtually anything that happens on this planet affects this Nation, and what is happening in Bosnia and in the Balkans right now is in fact affecting this Nation, and it will affect it even more if we do nothing. We have a very shallow window of opportunity to grab peace, and we should grab it with both hands, wrap out arms around it, and take it to the Balkans.

If we fail to do so, my colleagues, there is no doubt in my mind, having just visited that area, that we will have an expansion of this war to Kosovo, which will then trigger the Albanian input, which will then probably bring Macedonia in, which will then bring in Turkey, which will then bring in Greece, and then what do we have? We have the potential for World War III.

Mr. Speaker, we have history behind us that takes us back to World War I and World War II, both of which began in the Balkans. Do not let us help that start World War III. Support our troops and support the policy.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute, 30 seconds to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANZULLO], a member of our Committee on International Relations.

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, I would encourage the Members of Congress to examine the exact document which is called the peace agreement, especially the military annex which is attached to it, and to compare the rules of engagement there with the statement put out by the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the United States, and those rules of engagement contradict each other. In the one put out by the Joint Chiefs of Staff it says we are not to be involved in moving any people or

equipment out of the demilitarized zone, we are not to be involved in any type of disarmament, and yet the NATO troops, in the military annex attached the peace agreement, gives our troops that type of power.

Mr. Speaker, this is a matter of defining the mission to send our beloved troops to a country that has experienced war for 1,500 years. I support the troops. I do not believe it is wise to send them, but I support the troops.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of our time.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. BUNN].

Mr. BUNN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, having just returned from Bosnia, I was appalled at the devastation in Sarajevo. I did not see a single building that had not been damaged by the shelling of the sniper fire, and it is very, very clear that something has to be done, but I came back convinced that the President had made a horrible mistake in the decision to send our troops there.

We had an opportunity to listen to our military commanders tell us about how the troops are going to get in and how we are going to deal with the planning for casualties, how we have planned for communications, but when we asked about the exit strategy, there was no plan. We do not have a plan, how we are going to get our troops out of there. There was an alternative, and the plan was to lift the arms embargo and allow the Bosnians to defend themselves, and in meetings with the leaders in Bosnia the vice-president of Bosnia said point blank, ''We didn't ask for your troops, we didn't need your troops. What we needed was the ability to defend ourselves, and you denied us that.''

Nevertheless we need to understand today that there are troops there and troops on the way. Nothing we do tonight is going to stop the deployment. We are beyond that now. Congress is often faced with bad options, and President Clinton has given us bad options, but tonight we can choose to support the troops.

I am going to vote no on Dornan and support the alternative so we can do everything possible to allow our troops who are well trained and well equipped to do a job that they should not have been asked to do.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. INGLIS].

□ 1830

Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from yielding time to me.

There has been a fair amount of confusion on the floor here today about the thought process. One idea is we should support the troops by sending them there. The best way to support the troops is to keep them from going there.

Then there was a statement about how we are there to wage peace. I have never seen it waged with tanks and guns and bullets. I think if you are going to wage peace, you do not send in the U.S. Army. The U.S. Army goes into places to crush, kill, and destroy. That is what they are real good at. I do not understand this idea of waging peace with tanks and weapons. If there is a peace, there is no need for peacekeepers. They have peace. If there is not a peace, then our people are peacemakers and that makes them, I think, combatants in a centuries-old civil war.

Then there is the thought we have to contain the conflict. It is like world War II, we are told. Think again. World War II, two key differences: No. 1, a pernicious, expansionistic ideology that wanted to control the world. There is no pernicious, expansionistic ideology here. This is the normal inhumanity of man against man, normal hatred. It is around the globe. It is in Rwanda, it is in China, it is all over. No pernicious expansionistic ideology.

The second key difference between World War II and now, in World War II we were not prepared. Now we are prepared. We learned after World War II you prepare for peace by preparing for war, and you stand ready with that strength under control. We can contain the conflict no matter where it goes in that region.

The sober judgment we need to bring right now is very simple: Is there an American security interest at risk? I would submit, that is the threshold question before you send troops anywhere: Is there an American security interest at risk? Clearly there is not in the Balkans. The only way to send that message is to support the gentleman's alternative.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN].

(Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, for me the most important priority is to support our servicemen and women. The President has made his decision. While I am angry that he has made it without consultation to Congress and with the American people, we need to back up our troops 100 percent. Our actions tonight should send this message loudly and clearly to them as they prepare to go, because 25 years ago I was one of them in Vietnam. I was sent on a mission that bitterly divided this country and this House, but I learned then, as I know now, that our troops deserve nothing less than the undivided support of this House and all the resources necessary to support their mission. Please support the Buyer resolution.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR].

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, in 1954 one of my heroes, Senator John Stennis, spoke against sending American mechanics to a little country called South Vietnam. He said that we would get drawn into a land war that we could not win, in a part of the world that people did not care about. John C. Stennis was right. We did get sucked into it. Then when that happened, he did his constitutional duty to support those troops.

What I am asking this body to do tonight is to prevent us from getting sucked into another war where other brave young Americans will die, be maimed, in a part of the world that Americans just do not care about. It is not a right or wrong decision, it is what is best for the American young men and women who have sworn to defend this country.

The best thing for those fine young people is not to waste their lives, and above all, do not abuse their trust. They swore to defend the Constitution of this country. They swore to defend this country. We are not even a participant on this treaty. Vote for the Dornan alternative.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of our time to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], the ranking member of the Committee on National Security.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky). The gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] is recognized for 4¾ minutes.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, we come to the end of the general debate on this very significant and important issue. All of us in this room come to this debate from our various reference points. My reference point in this debate is as a peace advocate who came here 25 years ago to challenge militarism and to challenge the concept of military intervention. We opposed the war in Vietnam, military intervention in El Salvador, Nicaragua, Grenada, opposed our military intervention in the Persian Gulf.

We now find ourselves in the throes of a new era, an era referred to as the post-cold-war era, a period marked with change, with transition, a period pregnant with challenges and with opportunities.

But I would hasten to observe, Mr. Speaker, that there is a very interesting and fascinating disconnect in this country at this moment. At the grass roots level, the bedrock of a democracy, the American people look to Washington to say, ''What do we do, leaders, in this new post-cold-war era?'' The leaders in Washington, us being politicians who tend to poll, measure, count the votes, weight the mail and count the telephone calls, are saying, ''No, you tell us,'' so there is a great disconnect. Most politicians are not willing to step into a period of transition to lead. That is risky. Many American people are saying in this period of

transition, ''Tell us where to go.'' It is very difficult.

I am prepared to accept the challenge. I step into this breach. My argument, Mr. Speaker, is that yes, this is a period of change and transition, challenge and opportunity; perhaps wrongly, but I believe that this post-cold-war era has presented us with a significant enemy, and that enemy is war itself, war itself. The great challenge is the challenge of peace. The great opportunity is to bring the world, kicking and screaming, to peace.

Perhaps wrongly, Mr. Speaker, but I believe that in my entire adult lifetime we have been given a magnificent gift, the gift of the post-cold-war world, an opportunity to step forward boldly and bring about significant change in America and in the world. I believe that this is the first opportunity, Mr. Speaker, that we truly have to challenge the whole notion of the use of force and the making of war as an instrument of foreign policy, the first time; the first time we truly, as adults, can challenge these whole bizarre and barbaric ideas of using force to kill and maim and harm, and using war as an instrument of foreign policy.

I have lived long enough, Mr. Speaker, to come to this moment where we now truly have an opportunity to talk about the issue of peace. The transition that we are in, the pain that we feel, I believe is that we are witnessing the transition from war to peace, from warmaking to peacekeeping, from risking war to risking peace. These painful steps into the future, into the unknown, into transition, into change, are fraught with challenges. They are difficult.

Peacekeeping is a new concept, a new lexicon, not worn easily by politicians, not understood by the American people. It is not something we have done, but I believe that it is something that we need to do as we move into the post-cold-war world with respect to Bosnia. The moral imperative is as follows: If you encourage a group of people to come off the bloody battlefield of killing and maiming and raping and plundering, and move them to the negotiating table, and they come with a product, perfect or imperfect, good or bad, liked or disliked, a product, a peace plan, and then they say to you, ''He has murdered my son, I murdered his daughter, he murdered my mother, I murdered his father, we murdered 16,000 of our children and 250,000 of our neighbors. So while we have come to a peace plan, we do not rest easy with each other. We are paranoid about each other. We are fearful about each other. So stand in the way for a while to allow a period of transition as we move from the bloody battlefield to the issue of peace; so help us at this moment, because we are fearful. We have killed many of them.''

The moral question then is do you reject that notion? What is a peace advocate in a post-cold-war world? Do we walk away from that?

Finally, Mr. Speaker, when 6 million Jews were being killed during the period of Nazi Germany, as we looked back at that moment we said, ''How could that have occurred? Killing 6 million people is terrible.'' But there are 250,000 people dying in Bosnia. So what triggers your moral imperative? Six million people? Two hundred fifty thousand people? Where do you get upset?

Mr. Speaker, I would conclude by saying I think our role is one of peace. I think we have a responsibility to walk into this period as peacekeepers. I think we must address the moral imperative to play our significant role in the world. I think we ought to reject any effort to do anything less than that.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TIAHRT].

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I also went to Bosnia to meet our troops on the way in Germany and to receive a coin from the First Armored Division. This coin I plan to carry for the next 12 months, so I keep them in my thoughts and prayers. But this is a civil war. This is not a religious war. Only three of the five parties have initialed off this peace agreement.

Today, Bosnian Croats who did not initial this agreement are burning Bosnian Herzegovinian villages. This week they released a known war criminal. Bosnian Serbs, who also did not sign this peace agreement or initial this peace agreement, have two war criminals still commanding troops. This is an incomplete agreement. There will be no peace without justice. These people must be brought to justice.

This is just a trial separation before the divorce. We are giving them the opportunity to rest and rearm. We need to create other opportunities for peace, opportunities that will be there without sacrificing our young men and women. That is why I support the Dornan bill.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SCARBOROUGH].

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I am truly amazed at how the sides change here. Many of the same people who have been telling us for 20 years that we can no longer be the world's policeman are now coming to the floor saying, ''We must be the world's policeman,'' even when there is not a direct vital American interest worth dying for. Who said that? The Secretary of Defense, Secretary Perry, in Philadelphia, said there was not a direct vital American interest involved. So do we as a Congress have a right to stand up and say something? Yes. That is our constitutional right. Yet it amazes me that Republicans as well as Democrats say it is all the President's prerogative.

James Madison, the framer of the Constitution, in 1792 wrote to Thomas Jefferson and said the following:

> The Constitution supposes what the history of all governments demonstrate: that the executive is the branch of power most interested in war and most prone to it. It has, accordingly, with studied care, vested the question of war in the legislature.

It is our responsibility. Support Dornan and support the troops.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield the remainder of our time to the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] is recognized for 3¼ minutes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, this is a very difficult subject for me to even speak about. It is wrapped with emotion, it is wrapped with anger, and it is wrapped with pain. I do not think, no matter what you vote for today, if you vote for the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN], I am against sending the troops to Bosnia. I think if you vote for the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN], that is a message, again, that you do not want to do that. The Senate is not going to pick it up. I think that is an acceptable vote.

If you vote for the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BUYER] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON] to support our troops in what they are doing, I think that is acceptable, also, and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] as well. I am not concerned so much about the vote today, Mr. Speaker, as I am in the future.

Many of us served overseas. In 1968, President Johnson stopped the bombing over in North Vietnam. Our hands were tied.

□ 1845

I watched friends of mine die. They did not have to die. We had Mogia and Van Kari and Ban Nappi Pass where we could see supplies coming through, and we could not stop them.

There was an ROE that you had to wait until a MiG shot at you first before you could shoot back. No Member of Congress ever devised that ROE. They never strapped their rear end into a fighter.

I looked at the thousands of my friends that died over there when we could not hit the SAM sites and we could not mine the harbors. Yet when President Nixon came up, he let us do that.

My concern is in the future because there are going to be some tough votes. There are a lot of people here in this body that will do anything they can to cut defense. It is a legitimate issue. They would rather put it in social spending. But in the future, we are going to have to vote, ladies and gentlemen, on supporting our troops. Make sure that you do.

Another area that kills me, not just under this President. Lebanon was a disaster, to tie down our Marines.

Those kids died and they did not have to die. In Somalia, we have gone through the reasons why our troopers died. It is because we did not give them the support, the votes in this Congress and the President. Not just this President but other Presidents.

My real concern, Mr. Speaker, is the future. Because the votes are going to be tough. You are going to have to increase defense dollars probably if we get tied in there. I would ask my colleagues that want to cut defense, that want to cut defense, think about the amendments and the bills that you are going to vote for and all of them, because what you are saying is that you are going to support these kids. It is important. Do not forget the way you vote today.

Most of us have lost too many friends. There are 30 kids that fought in Vietnam and in Desert Storm that because of Tailhook are not passing and making Captain or Commander because there are certain people that would exacerbate that. Some of these kids had nothing to do with Tailhook. But yet the Senate failed to confirm them.

I would ask you, when we ask our men and our women to place their lives on the line, do not forget those sacrifices. Because we have over and over and over again, Mr. Speaker, and I would ask, think about your vote but carry it on after today.

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my opposition to the deployment of United States troops to the former Yugoslavia.

I have consistently voted to lift the arms embargo levied on the Bosnian Moslems. I firmly believe that President Bush and President Clinton were wrong in their policy to continue the arms embargo on Bosnia. The Bosnians have the right, as a sovereign people, to defend themselves against any form of aggression. By continuing the arms embargo, the United States and its allies have perpetuated the slaughter of innocent people.

I applaud the Dayton peace agreement initialed by the warring factions and the agreement to begin to re-arm the Bosnian Moslems in an attempt to return a balance of power to the region. However, I am skeptical of the agreement because all parties have not initialed the agreement and I have viewed very vocal and extremely aggressive anti-American sentiments in Bosnia. The peace is tenuous at best.

I have long questioned the role of the United States as the policeman of the world. Clearly there are other conflicts around the world that need policing, yet, no one has called for the use of the United States military. Not one Member of Congress has claimed that these conflicts are in the national interest of the United States or worth one drop of American blood. Still, Members call for American troops to sacrifice for the Bosnian civil war.

During the debate surrounding the deployment of United States troops to the Persian Gulf, many of my colleagues on the other side of the isle derided the deployment as the United States in the role of world policeman. These same Members are now supporting the deployment of troops to Bosnia because they claim that it is the duty of the United States to lead the world in policing the civil war.

Let me simply suggest to those Members: this is not the Persian Gulf. The United States deployed troops to the Persian Gulf as a direct result of military aggression by Iraq against Kuwait. The Bosnian deployment is a result of a weak peace agreement between warring factions of a centuries-old civil war that represents no risk to United States national security.

I do not support the deployment of troops to Bosnia because the President has not convinced me, my constituents, or the majority of Americans of the need for this military action. Yes, I recognize the authority of the President to commit troops, but I also recognize the authority of the U.S. Congress to authorize the use of the military. The President, after repeated requests by this body, has neglected to seek Congressional authorization for the deployment of the troops. For this reason I supported Mr. DORNAN'S bill to refuse to fund the military action in Bosnia.

The President has truly failed in his attempt to convince the American people that one American life is worth peace in Bosnia. My constituency is not convinced. Overwhelmingly, my constituents have written to me to oppose the deployment of troops to Bosnia. I will not allow this Nation to become the policeman for a regional civil war that has raged for hundreds of years and still simmers below the surface of this peace agreement.

I have supported the use of United States technical support and related assistance in the Bosnian theater. I did not oppose the use of United States airpower to protect the peackeepers in Bosnia because this is where the United States expertise lies. As the world leader in military technology, this is an acceptable role for the United States. However, I will not support the use of United States ground forces in the Bosnian theater. Ground support in the Balkans is the sole responsibility of the European nations. Europe has the singular obligation to protect the European continent and provide the force necessary to maintain peace in the European theater.

Due to the lack of a cohesive mission strategy and the inability of the President to convince the majority of the American people that deployment of United States troops to Bosnia is essential, I cannot support the deployment.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the peace that was brokered in Dayton that is supposed to resolve the civil war in Bosnia and Herzegovina is nothing but a thin, glass wall waiting to be shattered. It is just another cease-fire that will once again be broken by discontented parties. To send American ground troops into the thick tension that still prevails is nothing short of a kamikaze mission.

Many Bosnians want Americans to come and help enforce the peace established in Dayton. Unfortunately, this is not true peace. True peace does not require 60,000 foreign soldiers to police the streets. Bosnian Serbs living in Sarajevo are staging daily protests hoping that the peace settlement will be renegotiated. They are dissatisfied because under the Dayton agreement the suburbs of Sarajevo that they call home will be turned over to the newly created Croat-Muslim Federation, which most view as a fate worse than death. This one provision in a multifaceted agreement is enough for some to pick up arms once again. Because Bosnian Serbs are so discontent with the agreement, their leaders announced they would hold a referendum on December 12, to ask their citizens whether or not they should accept the Dayton peace plan.

The fact that Croatian President Franco Tudjman, Serbian President Slobodan Milosevic and Bosnian President Alija Izetbegovic were able to sit down in one room together and over the course of a few weeks, create a plan for peace is, of course, nothing short of a miracle. President Clinton and his administration ought to be commended for accomplishing the unthinkable. The problem though is that only presidents and foreign ministers present agreed to stop the war; no one consulted the people. It is the people who have festered hatred in their hearts which has caused this civil war. There cannot be a workable peace solution unless the people want it, unless they are willing to put away their deep-seated hatred for one another and say enough is enough.

This tenuous peace which 60,000 NATO troops must enforce will be led by American troops and was promised to the warring factions before the American public could have its say. In fact, the understanding of the three warring parties before they came to the peace table was that America would be there to monitor the final agreement. But we cannot send 20,000 of your young, vibrant men and women to enforce a peace that is not going to last. President Clinton has promised Bosnia the lives of thousands of our young people for 1 year. Does President Clinton really believe that hatred which spans to course of hundreds of years is going to be resolved in 1 year?

Why do we want to subject our soldiers to the wrath of the Serbs? What will these young men and women be to angry Serbs? Targets. Targets of their frustration of being bombed by American-led NATO war planes. Targets for their frustration of losing large amounts of territory to Croatia this past summer. Targets for their frustration of being forced to accept a peace plan they do not agree to. Targets for the anger of Serbs who were bombed by Americans in Sarajevo. Targets along the slim stretch of land, Brcko, that the Serbs want expanded and handed over to them. And when our soldiers are not the targets of snipers they will be subject to the threat of thousands upon thousands of landmines that will be covered by the winter snow, Yes, the best way for factions who are reluctant to go along with the Dayton agreement to sabotage peace is for them to attack Americans.

And why should Americans be deliberately put in harms way? What vital interest does America have in Bosnia? None. We have no vital interest in Bosnia. Secretary of State Warren Christopher called Bosnia ''the problem from Hell.'' Political leader for the Bosnian Serbs, Radovan Karadzic, who has the responsibility of drumming up support for the agreement said, ''What is wrong with the Dayton agreement is that it has created a new Beirut in Europe. It is going to bleed for decades.'' Why does this require that we put American lives on the ground in a country whose hatred is older than our Republic? This is a civil war that must be resolved by its own citizens. It took nothing short of a totalitarian regime to maintain the peace during this century. One year of peacekeeping will not solve

their problems or further any of our interests. For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I will vote today for H.R. 2770 to prohibit the use of Federal funds from being used for the deployment of United States Armed Forces on the grounds of the Republic of Bosina and Herzegovina.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the President will be in Paris to witness the signing of the peace accord that will officially end the 43-month war in Bosnia. The United States will be standing proud as the instigator of the process that took place last month in Dayton, at which the leaders of Serbia, Croatia, and Bosnia agreed to end the savage ethnic warfare that has claimed more than 250,000 lives over the past 4 years. This will be a great day for the people of Bosnia, and certainly a proud moment for those nations involved in the peace process. There is much work ahead in implementing the vision of peaceful coexistence in the Balkans, but with the determination of all of the NATO countries to extend the guarantee of European stability, it is truly a cause worth the effort.

Under this agreement one state with a unified, constitutional government will be created. Free elections will be held throughout Bosnia next year. Territorial issues within Bosnia have been resolved, and within these boundaries, all Bosnians will have the right to move freely. Those displaced from their homes by the fighting will finally be able to return home. Best of all, perhaps, is that the parties have agreed to respect the human rights of all persons, and those individuals who have been responsible for the heinous crimes perpetrated against the Bosnian people will be brought to justice.

This agreement represents great progress. While some of my colleagues here in the House today have expressed skepticism, I firmly believe that this peace can and will work. The leaders of all sides in this conflict have affirmed a true desire for peace on behalf of their people who are weary from the harshness of the conflict they've experienced. The people themselves have encouraged their respective leaders to follow the course of reconciliation.

What is required to make this plan work is simple: a neutral intermediary to enforce the peace accords for a time sufficient to allow the establishment of the new government. Clearly, this role can only be served by NATO. No other international organization has the capacity and respect to undertake such a critical operation. The mission itself is one that NATO is particularly capable of accomplishing. But it is equally true that NATO cannot accomplish the task without the direct and substantial participation of the United States. We have an obligation to participate and we have a direct interest in doing so because of the impact on the stability of Europe. Without our agreement to join NATO on this endeavor, other nations would decline to participate and the peace would assuredly fail. And then the fierce fighting would resume.

I am confident that our participation in this peacekeeping mission will be both limited and well-defined. U.S. troops, serving under an American commander, have been given rules of engagement sufficient to provide them with the ability to protect themselves and carry out their assigned tasks. Our role in the implementation force, although significant, will be limited to about one-third of the NATO contingent, with more than 60,000 troops coming from European and other nations. And our role will be limited in duration: the President has expressed the clear intent of withdrawing American troops in a year.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, the President's decision to send United States troops to Bosnia is an appropriate and necessary use of power by the world's only superpower designed to bring peace to the Balkans. It is a mission we neither sought nor savior. These troops are not being sent into a war. Rather, they are going to support a peace treaty. Last month, in Dayton, OH, the three Balkan leaders initialized a peace treaty that would halt the fighting between the Serbians, Croatians, and Bosnians. Two months ago, while the fighting was raging across the former Yugoslavia, I would have refused to endorse a plan sending American troops to Bosnia. Today, however, American troops are not being sent to Bosnia to engage in an active military conflict. Instead, they form the backbone of a peacekeeping mission that will at long last bring stability to an area of the world that has only seen violence and misery for so many years. Surely there is risk in sending our soldiers overseas. However, it serves our national interest to help bring peace and stability to the Balkans and to Europe.

Before we send our soldiers to Bosnia, however, it is imperative that we develop a comprehensive exist strategy to guarantee that our troops will not fall into another intractable quagmire. As wisely highlighted by the Senate Majority Leader BOB DOLE, if we leave Bosnia without allowing all the parties to stand on equal ground, we will find ourselves debating these same issues in the very near future. The United States must ensure that before our soldiers return home, the Bosnian Army has the ability to defend itself and its people.

Mr. MARTINI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to strongly support tonight's efforts to prevent American troops from serving on the ground in Bosnia.

This Congress has voted repeatedly in Congress and told President Clinton that we had no desire to send Americans to participate in a peacekeeping mission that is of no vital interest to us, of questionable prospects for lasting success, and that puts at risk thousands of American lives.

I hope peace prevails in that troubled region, and that the recently negotiated peace holds and the bloodshed and misery in the Balkans soon ends.

But we have no vital interests at stake in the region, and should not get involved.

There is no overriding strategic or economic threat to the United States there.

The war has not yet spilled outside of the former Yugoslavia, and we have already taken steps toward containing the fighting.

And NATO won't fall apart if we do not participate.

NATO is a strong alliance, a collection of Western democracies bound together by common interest.

That common interest will not go away if we do not go to Bosnia.

As for our prospects for success, exactly how will a 1 year deployment of peacekeeping troops solve a conflict that has raged for centuries?

It took the iron fists of one empire after another to keep the underlying ethnic tensions in this area under control.

It is unfortunate, but true: signatures on a piece of paper and a brief intervention of foreign troops will not quell the hatreds that dominate the former Yugoslavia.

Yet to pursue this questionable objective, we are asked to risk the lives of 20 thousand American troops.

The President wants to put them in the crosshairs of sniper's rifles, and subject them to the jeopardy that comes with the thousands of land mines that are buried over there.

Angry mobs are already gathering in the streets to demonstrate against out mission.

We are sending our men and women into an unfamiliar and dangerous hornet's nest, and for the wrong reasons.

I support the troops, and am grateful for their efforts on our behalf.

They have a very difficult mission to carry out, and I am sure they will do a fine job when they do.

But it is a mission that will come at great cost, and it is one we should try to avoid for them completely.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, tonight, this House faces a choice. We can choose to support the President of the United States in his decision to help end the tragic war in Bosnia, in his decision to act with our NATO allies to stop the killing in Europe for the third time this century, in his decision to nurture a peace that without question will be fraught with its own risks and dangers. Or, we can choose to desert the President at this time of challenge to American leadership, to seek moral comfort for this country in the failure of Europeans to end the slaughter, to watch the war resume content that the vital interest of the United States might this time escape the blight of war in Europe. As between a problematic peace and a horrific war, I choose to support the President's courageous work for peace.

Mr. Speaker, many of the people I represent have contacted me to express their concerns about the Dayton peace plan for Bosnia and the risks our troops may face as part of a international force to implement that plan. I've had many of the same concerns myself.

Earlier this month I joined 14 other members of the House on a bipartisan fact-finding tour of Bosnia and other countries in the region to address these concerns. We met with American, NATO and U.N. military commanders and diplomats, soldiers from Colorado, and the presidents of Serbia, Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina. I've also met with the President; the Vice President; Richard Holbroke, the Assistant Secretary of State who negotiated the Dayton accords; Samuel Berger, the Deputy Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs; and Lt. Gen. Howell Estes and Lt. Gen. Wes Clark of the Joint Staff. I asked them the same questions that Coloradans have been asking me.

At a town meeting this past Saturday, I heard again from people in my district, and I talked with them about what I had seen and learned.

Based on all that I've been able to learn, I believe the American role in leading the NATO implementation force is essential and that the mission of the implementation force is well-planned and appropriate.

I'm well aware that as we go down the path envisioned by the Dayton agreement, there is no guarantee of success. I have questions about having the new civil and political institutions up and running after the one year NATO deployment concludes, progress that will be important to sustaining the peace. Nevertheless, our contribution to the peacekeeping deployment gives us the best chance we have

had to stop a dangerous war that has been raging for four years in Europe.

Critics of this mission have said that the war in Bosnia is really a European problem and that we should let the Europeans solve it. But the truth is that we cannot afford to duck our responsibility as the leader of NATO during this defining moment in Europe's post-cold war history. We have largely deferred to the Europeans on this problem for 4 years, and they have never been able to reach a consensus on how to solve it. Without United States leadership the war in Bosnia will continue. Two tragic world wars should have taught us what can happen when we turn our back on Europe in a time of crisis.

Our military mission in Bosnia will not be risk free; there will no doubt be casualties. But the mission has been carefully planned and trained for; American military leaders have been preparing for this mission for 18 months and helped to write the military annex to the Dayton agreement. The 1-year time frame for the military deployment is part of the plan that our military leaders helped craft—it is not some arbitrary deadline imposed from the outside for purely political reasons. The mission statement is clear, and our commanders in the field have unprecedented authority to respond to challenges and threats with overwhelming and decisive force. While it is impossible to plan for every contingency, I'm persuaded most have been anticipated.

Our troops are well-trained in the recognition, detection, and clearing of land mines. They'll be equipped with sophisticated detection equipment and protective gear. Protection from the hazard of mines is a key reason our military planners chose a heavy armored division for this assignment. And keep in mind that the Dayton agreement calls for the warring factions to clear the mines they have planted. Yet, there will no doubt be casualties from mines.

Our troops will likely face attack from some rogue elements outside the chain of command of the regular armies. We will have a remarkable capability to detect and track hostile elements, however, and overwhelming force to deter and repel attack.

The question of an exit strategy has been repeatedly raised by critics of the plan. This strikes me as a false issue. Exit after 1 year is expressly built into the Dayton agreement, with time-defined tasks and objectives. U.S. military commanders were quite clear that they have no question about when and how they'll depart. They also made it clear that if the parties to the agreement aren't serious about keeping peace and fighting resumes, we will withdraw our troops.

There are risks and problems in the civil-political parts of the Dayton agreement, too. It includes an ambitious timetable for economic reconstruction, humanitarian activities and the formulation of new political institutions, and the power arrangements crafted to create the new Bosnian state seem awkward at best. But a massive international effort has already been launched by the London conference to coordinate the myriad of humanitarian and political projects that will have to be undertaken to support the agreement. We can only hope that enough will be in place to sustain the peace when the troops go home at the end of next year. And it may well make sense at that time, under circumstances then very different from the last 4 years, for some international police authority to assist with security for a longer period.

We should be under no illusion that Presidents Milosevic, Izetbegovic, and Tudjman entered this agreement out of altruism. Just as self-interest brought these three leaders to the table in Dayton, it will be self-interest that will encourage them to keep their bargain and make peace work. All three have calculated that their future lies with the West. Izetbegovic is struggling to find a way for his country to survive as an independent state. Milosevic is desperate to put a permanent end to the devastating international embargo that has destroyed the Serbian economy. And Tudjman wants to expand trade with Europe and to press for admission to European institutions.

So, the peace reached at Dayton is a messy, pragmatic arrangement. Sadly it is not a just peace, because it ratifies the gains of war. But I believe this peace is better than continued war with its horrors and injustices.

Mindful of all these risks and uncertainties and imperfections, if we don't keep our commitment to help enforce the Dayton peace agreement, we'll pay a great price. The war will resume, and we will have forfeited American leadership and credibility. If the war spills over to Kosovo and Macedonia, it would cause enormous damage to our security interests in Europe by drawing Albania, Bulgaria, Greece, and Turkey into the conflict. This risk of conflict between NATO member states and a broader European war can't be lightly dismissed.

Ten days ago in Sarajevo, we encountered a group of the long-suffering people of that city outside the Presidential Palace. An older woman, tears spilling from her eyes, told us that she had lost her son in the war; she pleaded that only America had the trust of the Bosnian people and the power to end the war. It was a poignant reminder that this is not a problem that can be solved by Europeans without American leadership.

The next day I had lunch with two impressive young Army troopers from Colorado awaiting final orders to Bosnia at their 1st Armored Division base in Germany. One of these men had taken his Thanksgiving leave to visit the former Nazi concentration camp at Dachau. Referring to the mission ahead of him, he said, ''Congressman, if we have the power to keep that from happening again, we have to do it.'' A reminder of an earlier problem that could not be solved by Europeans without American leadership.

So, it is important to remember that this is not just about Bosnia. Other actors around the world are watching these events and will be taking their cue. If leaders of dispossessed ethnic groups elsewhere in Europe and in the new states of the former Soviet Union see that the international community is unable to act effectively, they may well challenge the political compromises that have been worked out in their states. Eventually, much of what we won in the cold war could be put at risk.

The President has not done an adequate job in making the case for the deployment of American soldiers in Bosnia. This surely makes it harder for members of Congress to support him, because it makes it harder for the American people to understand what's at stake. Still, the President's commitment to send a U.S. military force to help to enforce peace has been clear for a long time.

The President has shown courage in taking on this difficult responsibility in the face of political risks and public opposition. A vote for this resolution to oppose the mission will only serve to encourage both the enemies of peace in Bosnia and the enemies of United States leadership in pursuit of a decent international order.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I have deep concerns about the mission which the President has assigned to our Armed Forces to implement the Bosnia agreement reached in Dayton last month.

I remain deeply troubled by the President's decision to deploy United States troops in support of the Bosnia peace agreement. First of all, this is an unworkable agreement—that it is the best agreement attainable does not make it a good agreement. I have serious doubts that this agreement, even if it were fully implemented, would be successful in the long term. Moreover, the President has failed to make a convincing case that the conflict in Bosnia threatens our national security interests, or that implementation of the Dayton accords will resolve those concerns. He has also blurred the distinction between peacekeeping and peacemaking.

I am also deeply concerned about the conditions on the ground for our troops. Bosnia, particularly the area around Tuzla where United States troops will be based, is heavily mined. The great majority of these minefields are not mapped, and many of the mines in use in Bosnia are not easily detected. Furthermore, United States troops who may be taken prisoner will not be afforded the protections of the Geneva Convention for prisoners of war; they will not even have the legal status and guarantees of POW's.

Lastly, does anyone really believe that this mission will last only 1 year? Timetables on many international agreements in recent years have been much too ambitious, and inevitably have been revised and extended. I have serious doubts that this agreement, as contentious and entailed as it is, can meet its timetable.

Last month, I voted for legislation in the House forbidding the use of appropriated funds for the President's proposed Bosnia peacekeeping mission unless he requested a specific authorization of appropriations for the mission. I believe that the Commander-in-Chief, although not constitutionally required to do so in all cases, should always come to Congress for approval of the deployment of U.S. troops in area of conflict. However, I will not vote to cut off funding for our service men and women when they have already been deployed; I will give our troops as much support as they need to carry out their mission to the best of their ability. I oppose H.R. 2770; I support the Buyer resolution.

Mr. EWING of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the bills in opposition to President Clinton's misguided Bosnia policies. I support these bills because I support the men and women troops being asked by President Clinton to put their lives at risk.

The President believes he may conduct this policy without the approval of Congress. However, Congress does have a responsibility to address this issue, particularly when Congress is expected to provide the funding for this endeavor. This House has already voted twice advising the President not to send ground troops into Bosnia, but he has ignored that advice. I see no reason why we should now give him our consent.

The President has failed to explain to the American people clearly what our goals and objectives are in Bosnia or what national security issues are at stake there. He simply offers vague statements about securing peace. We are all deeply concerned about the terrible ethnic warfare occurring in Bosnia, but we cannot send American troops into a deadly situation without a clearly defined military mission, a firm timetable for their commitment, and a plan for getting them out. Furthermore, the President has failed to tell us how much this endeavor will cost the American taxpayers.

I commend the various parties involved in the civil war for finally reaching a peace agreement recently, at least on paper. However, the long history of violence in Bosnia demonstrates that this agreement could easily fall apart. If it does, this time thousands of American troops will be in the firing line.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, the American people are strongly opposed to the President's policy. In my own congressional district, constituent phone calls to my offices have been more than 5 to 1 against sending ground troops into Bosnia. We should have learned from the Vietnam war that a successful military mission requires strong support from the American people.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, there is not a Member of this House that does not hope the Dayton peace agreement ends the bloodshed in Bosnia and Hercegovina. Three-and-a-half years of war and destruction must end, so that thousands more innocent lives are spared.

However, I do not believe that the United States must or should send ground troops to continue to be a leader in implementing this agreement. Thus far, we have provided essential air, naval, and logistic support activities to our NATO allies. We could continue to operate in this capacity in order to make sure the peace is kept.

Only a few months ago, we led the NATO air strikes against the Bosnian Serbs. How can our troops now be seen as neutral peacekeepers? Being viewed as partisans is a major threat to their safety, and already there is dissension among the parties to the peace agreement.

The first bill considered today, offered by Mr. DORNAN, expresses the position I have held on this issue from the beginning. This is the view that hundreds of my constituents have voiced, as well. They believe that there is no compelling argument for sending ground troops. This conflict is replete with many ethnic and historical issues which will not be resolved by deploying our service members.

As a Member of Congress, I could never turn my back on the men and women who so bravely serve our country. Preceding the gulf war, I voted against similar resolutions to send in American troops. After they were sent, however, they needed and deserved the support of Congress. That is why the resolutions offered by Messrs. SKELTON and HAMILTON will also receive my vote today. We have a responsibility to give these brave and dedicated men and women our unqualified backing in their mission and these two resolutions accomplish that purpose.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, already patriotic American young men and women are in the former Yugoslavia preparing for the arrival of thousands of troops to help implement the recent peace agreement. President Clinton, without the support of the American people or the Congress, has exercised his Presidential authority to send troops into action without the consent of Congress.

Republicans don't question the President's authority as Commander-in-Chief to send United States troops to Bosnia. We do question his judgment.

I believe the President has made a grave mistake. He has put Americans in danger without clearly articulating what national security interest requiring the use of United States forces is at stake in Bosnia. The President's promise to send some 20,000 United States ground forces into war-torn Bosnia was made in an off-hand remark more than 2 years ago. It became a commitment in search of a mission.

President Clinton made the promise without seeking the support of the American people. As a result, both the American public and the Congress have been shut out of the process that now involves sending American men and women into a very dangerous situation. This fact is highlighted by numerous polls indicating that close to 60 percent of Americans continue to disapprove of the Clinton plan.

There is no doubt that Republicans will unconditionally support our troops now and throughout the entire time they are deployed. We will make sure they are properly armed and have every resource available so they can adequately defend themselves.

However, the President needs to understand that he has not successfully made his case, as is demonstrated by the fact that the House has voted three times in opposition to his policy. Unfortunately, the President has chosen to ignore our counsel. Today will mark the House's final attempt prior to the signing of the peace agreement in Paris to express to the President the will of the American people with regard to sending our young Americans to Bosnia.

Mr. President, please take heed this time.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, we must support our troops. We cannot fail to support our troops. If we cut off funds to our troops we are failing to support them.

We must also support the President. He has created an environment for peace through the Dayton Agreement that hasn't been seen for 4 years in Bosnia. Four years of relentless killing; 4 years of non-stop ethnic cleansing; 4 years of unspeakable horror.

Every soldier knows that his chain of command is vital to his well being. The President is the Commander in Chief. Therefore the well being of our troops depends on support for the President.

The leaders of the warring sides have agreed to a peace. NATO is the only body that can enforce that peace. America is NATO's leader. Without NATO, the peace plan for Bosnia will collapse. NATO may collapse if the United States fails to lead in Bosnia. Turkey and Greece, both strong members of NATO, have conflicting sympathies in Bosnia. If the United States fails to act in Bosnia the war there may reignite, and it may drag members of NATO into it on opposing sides. Without American leadership, the peace agreement can not survive.

The opportunity for peace is at hand. We need to act now. We need to support the President's initiative for peace.

The Dayton Peace Agreement settles the territorial issues that caused the war. The Dayton Peace Agreement commits all parties to the conflict to cooperate with the investigation and prosecution of war criminals.

If we fail to act now to enforce the peace, we may later find ourselves with no choice but to once again become involved in a broader European war. The Balkans have been an historically volatile place. We are presented with an historic opportunity to contain that volatility.

The peace agreement is now larger than Bosnia. It is about America's leadership in the world. It is about America keeping its word. If America fails to lead a peace plan brokered in the heartland of America, America's credibility around the world is irreparably damaged. North Korea, Iraq, and other countries that have aggressive intentions will no longer take America at its word. Failing to act in Bosnia opens a Pandora's box of worldwide troubles. American is only as good as her word. We must remain reliable in order to be taken seriously by every country with whom we conduct foreign policy, and that is every country in the world.

Do not vote to cut America's soldiers off. Support the troops. Support the soldiers. Support the President. Support America's leadership role in the world. Support the peace.

MR. SCHAEFER. Mr. Speaker, as President Clinton Boards Air Force One for Paris to sign the Bosnian Peach accords, 20,000 American troops prepare to embark on a trip to Bosnia. They will spend the holidays in a strange and hostile land. Though I Know they will serve with distinction and honor, I cannot support President Clinton's unilateral decision to deploy these young men and women without first seeking approval from Congress.

President Clinton is sending our troops to Bosnia to enforce an agreement that many Bosnians themselves reject. Look at a map and see how difficult it will be to police an effective peace. There are pockets of Croat-controlled areas, there are pockets of Moslem-controlled areas and there are Serb-Controlled areas forming a virtual horseshoe around half of Bosnia. It would be necessary to deploy hundreds of thousands of troops throughout these various area for many, many years—perhaps decades, in order to effectively separate and pacify these warring factions. President Clinton's politically inspired withdrawal deadline of 1 year almost seems to ensure that in the long-term, open hostilities will resume once foreign troops are removed.

Now I do not pretend to have the key to peace in Bosnia, nor do I wish the suffering to continue. That is why I salute President Clinton's attempts to mediate a peace accord. However, I regret that he was unable to Broker a peace treaty that would essentially be self-enforcing—one which would give all Bosnians incentives to uphold its terms and conditions without the necessity of massive foreign troop involvement. If most Bosnians are not convinced that peace is in their best interest, then I fear that the Dayton peace accords will be short-lived. And our troops will be at risk from the day they arrive in Bosnia.

I would like to remind President Clinton and my friends who support his unilateral troop deployment that Congress has spoken twice in recent months on this issue with a clear voice: On October 20, by a vote of 315–103, the House voted for the nonbinding Buyer-McHale resolution opposing deployment of United States troops to Bosnia. On November 17, less than a month ago, the House once again

spoke on this issue, voting 241–171 for Mr. HEFLEY'S binding resolution stating that no money is to be spent on deployment to Bonsnia unless it is specifically authorized by Congress.

In recent polls the American people have spoken on Bosnia. In a ''CBS News poll'' on November 27, 58 percent of Americans said they were opposed to sending United States troops to Bosnia as part of an international peacekeeping force.

My constituents have spoken on Bosnia. As of December 8, my office has received 603 letters and phone calls opposing United States involvement in Bosnia. How many have called or written in favor of deployment? All of 18.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot in good conscience support the President's troop deployment to Bosnia which might result in the loss of American lives in an ill-defined and dangerous attempt at nation-building.

As our failed intervention in Somalia demonstrated, American troops cannot force peace and good-neighborliness on a reluctant local population.

Mr. BUNNING. Mr. Speaker, once again the House is going to express the will of the American people regarding the Clinton policy in Bosnia. The American people do not want our troops to go to Bosnia.

Mr. Clinton and his followers have never made the case that this country's vital interests are at stake in Bosnia. That is why this House has repeatedly voted to oppose the deployment of U.S. forces there.

There is simply no compelling reason for one drop of American blood to be shed in that troubled country. Contrary to Mr. Clinton's contention that this is a NATO matter, there is no threat to NATO from Bosnia.

NATO is a mutual defense pact. The members of NATO are pledged to treat an invasion or attack on one of the members as an attack on all. There is not threat of an invasion of any NATO country by Bosnia. Bosnia is not going to invade Canada or Germany or England.

What is happening in Bosnia is a civil war. It has been a horrible bloody affair with thousands of innocent people killed or hurt. But, it makes no sense to inject U.S. forces into that situation when we do not have any vital interest at stake.

In my book, the injury or death of even one American soldier is not acceptable if there is no threat to the security of the United States. Clearly, there is no such threat in the case of the civil war in Bosnia.

I feel for the people of Bosnia and I hate the fact that they have been suffering during this war. It has been brutal. But, there are brutal civil wars going on in several countries and we are not contemplating putting our military personnel into those fights; we should not.

There is no more moral imperative to intervene in Bosnia than there is for United States intervention in Sri Lanka or Sudan. It is horrible that there is evil in the world and that men do wretched things to one another. But, it is not the job of the U.S. military to act as the world's security guard.

Our military exists to protect our national security, not for enforcing other people's peace treaties.

History is not on the side of those who, in my estimation, naively believe that we can solve the Bosnians' problems for them. The ethnic, religious, and territorial rivalries among the Serbs, Croats, and Moslems are many centuries old.

The battles that the Bosnians are fighting today have their roots in the atrocities committed over the centuries. Bosnia has been conquered, controlled, traded, and oppressed by the various empires, kingdoms, and dictatorships that have ruled the region.

We cannot change their history and we cannot assuage their mutual grievances. The peace that was brokered in Dayton, OH, may make us feel good about ourselves but it is a paper peace and our soldiers will be shot at with real bullets.

We have all seen the old films of British Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain coming down the steps of the airplane waiving the peace treaty with Hitler and boldly proclaiming peace in our time. Let's not repeat that mistake.

We intervened in the civil war in Vietnam. Let's not forget the lesson we learned from that. Congress should not give a blank check for the use of our forces to a President who has not spelled out exactly why they should be sent and what they are to accomplish and how we are to get them out.

The policy is wrong. The American people do not want it. This House has repeatedly rejected it; but, Mr. Clinton has ignored us.

I urge my friends and colleagues to vote to support the troops and to oppose the Clinton intervention policy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky). All time for debate pursuant to the first section of House Resolution 304 has expired.

Pursuant to section 2 of House Resolution 304, it is now in order to consider the bill, H.R. 2770.

PROHIBITION OF FUNDS FOR DEPLOYMENT OF ARMED FORCES IN BOSNIA

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 304, I call up the bill (H.R. 2770) to prohibit Federal funds from being used for the deployment on the ground of United States Armed Forces in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina as part of any peacekeeping operation, or as part of any implementation force, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2770

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR DEPLOYMENT ON THE GROUND OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES IN THE REPUBLIC OF BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA AS PART OF ANY PEACEKEEPING OPERATION OR IMPLEMENTATION FORCE.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no Federal funds shall be appropriated or otherwise available for the deployment on the ground of United States Armed Forces in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina as part of any peacekeeping operation, or as part of any implementation force.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 2 of House Resolution 304, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] will be recognized for 30 minutes and a Member opposed, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, those Members that were on the floor and missed the evening ABC news tonight missed some very graphic videotape from Tuzla.

The airport at Sarajevo has been closed all day today and the better part of yesterday. No C–5's or C–141's, our biggest transport airplanes, will go into either the Tuzla airport or to Sarajevo. It is going to be all tough C–130 Hercs or the C–17 at some point in the future when the runways are perfected.

Tuzla has 2½ feet of snow, it is snowing at this moment, it is going to snow all night. There is a frontal system throughout the whole Balkan area. The mountains, where the mines are, are all in dense fog. The winds are 25 knots gusting to 35 causing snow drifts, and they expect 28 degrees at the city levels, much less up in the hills, and the 2 foot of snow will stay for weeks if not months to come, and more will be added to it.

I wish someone in this Chamber could explain to me why this operation, Task Force Eagle, could not have been implemented the day after Christmas. Why do we take all these families, including mothers, away from their kids and their mates in Germany and a lot of reserve units having their civilian employment interrupted to go over there, 12 days before Christmas?

I am going to vote, of course, for the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BUYER] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON]. IKE has two sons on active duty. I have two Dornan nephews, a lieutenant in the Air Force and a lieutenant commander in the Navy who has 35 some missions in the gulf war.

They tell me privately, all the military people I meet with, that this is a terrible way to put men and women in harm's way, but once they get the call, they are ready to try and do their best.

This is going to come back to haunt a lot of Members, their Dornan vote tonight. December 13, 1995 is going to come back to haunt people, Mr. Speaker.

When a Gold Star mother comes to a Member in this House and says that you do everything to keep Americans from going back to Europe after 50 years of keeping their peace and two bloody wars, and the Pope did not tell anybody to put American ground troops in there so that this century would not end in Sarajevo the way it began in 1914.

The factor of supporting the troops is a given in this House. I do not know anybody in this House, the most liberal Member, the most conservative, I do not know anybody at this point after Desert Storm and what we did to our forces in Vietnam and tragedies like Beirut and the fact that thousands of young men and women die every year in training, I do not know anybody in this Chamber who does not truly have intense, deep affection for our troops.

But many Members have not met Herb Shugart, the father of one of our

two last Medal of Honor winners from the streets of Mogadishu. He would not shake Clinton's hand.

Herb Shugart told me the whole story. He said, ''Mr. President, why do you fly a warlord Aideed on our airplanes with Marine guard? You wouldn't ask my son's Army to guard him just days after he had killed 19 of our men. Why did you fly him to Addis Ababa?''

Clinton said to him, ''It was a good military operation, Mr. Shugart. You son did not die in vain.''

He said, ''How would you know what a good military operation was?''

It went on from there, and finally he said, ''I have nothing more to say to you.''

The press, some of the press, most of the press, suppressed that story. I do not think there are five Members in this Chamber that know that our two Medal of Honor winners, Gary Gordon, buried in Lincoln, ME, and Randy Shugart, buried in Carlisle, PA, were not just dragged through the streets before our eyes but their bodies were horribly mutilated and then burned and then dumped on the steps of the U.N. every 2 days.

And then I am told by nice men like Christopher and Perry and Shalikashvili that, ''Well, we've learned our lessons from Somalia.'' Learned our lessons from Somalia? Did we not learn anything from Reagan's mistake in Beirut? Did we not learn anything from Vietnam? Did we not learn anything from the cold in Korea? Ask CHARLIE RANGEL about trying to concentrate to fight when you are freezing to death.

No, we did not have to rush in to rescue our European NATO friends when we are doing over 90 percent of the airlift, 90 percent of the sea lift, 90 percent of the sea power in the Adriatic. More like 95. The air strikes were 95 percent ours in August and September. Ninety percent of the food, the logistics, 100 percent of the hospital at Zagreb in Croatia. And when it comes to intelligence, it is all ours, from the unmanned aerial vehicles to the super architecture of our big satellites. Is that not a Treasury commitment of the American people?

I am not an isolationist, far from it. I went up to Walter Reed Hospital and met all the wounded men up there. Chris Reed was trying to rescue the bodies, not the men, the bodies of a helicopter that went down September 25, 1993, days before the horrible firefight, and he lost his arm and his leg. His fiancee married him anyway—beautiful ceremony up at Walter Reed. I flew over 200 flags on the roof of this Capitol with my 5 oldest grandchildren. I sent little Medals of Honor to the parents of Shurgart and Gordon because the Army had forgotten that parents raise the young heroes. The wives get the Medals of Honor posthumously.

This is a Gold mother, a Gold mother vote tonight. It is a widow vote. It is a vote to tell a couple of young kids and a handsome young father why their mother was hit by a sniper in Tuzla or some area in those hills.

I wish all Members could get the intelligence briefing I had today. By the way, you can. Every one of us has a top secret briefing. Go get the briefing that I got today on who are our friends there and who are not our friends. The war criminals are on their best behavior, the victims are furious that they lost 49 percent of their country, and the older politicians who cut the best deal they could to have their nation partitioned in half, and we are going to enforce the partition, they cannot sell their younger people on the anger that they have lost what they wanted, not to be a multicultural state but an Islamic state.

The intensity of the hatred with some of these folks reminds you of the 8, 14-way split in Afghanistan, reminds you of the worst of Lebanon, the worst of Vietnam.

I am going to vote against Mr. HAMILTON's amendment, because I think it is naive and a fig leaf and it acts like all 20,000 troops are in there. The news tonight said, I stand corrected, it is not 97, it is about 150 people are on the ground. Period. Nobody is getting in tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to call this the Dornan-Scarborough—because he has led my freshman—Freshmen amendment, ''freshmen'' for the baker's dozen, the 13 of you over there, because I predict, without any fear of being wrong, that some seats are going to be lost in November based on how people vote here.

I want everybody to realize that we are a pretty elite group here now. Almost all of our kids go to college. This blue collar warfare that we started, putting our men and women in harm's way, started in Korea and it was perfected in Vietnam.

I am going to give some time to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] to speak out for the families who have their sons and daughters wear our uniforms as police, fire people, deputy sheriffs, and in all of our services. Then I am going to give 1 minute to as many freshmen as I can who were on the trip this weekend, last weekend, or the weekend before who have a totally different opinion than some of the people who have already spoken.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the distinguished gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR].

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Dornan resolution as the only crystal-clear vote this House will cast on this precedent-setting U.S. military involvement of our ground forces in an unstable former Soviet bloc nation.

I rise in support of the Dornan resolution as the only crystal clear vote this House will cast on this precedent-setting U.S. military involvement of our ground forces in an unstable former Soviet bloc nation. The most assured way of maintaining our troops' safety is not sending them there in the first place.

Moreover, there is no possibility that the age-old hatreds that have fueled the killings and plunder in the former Yugoslavia will be calmed in one year. Reestablishing civility in that region will require years of dedicated commitment, and the resources to back it up. Other instabilities in that corner of the globe are likely to bubble up in years ahead. Unless Europe, now rebuilt 50 years after World War II, seizes its proper leadership role, the United States cannot keep filling the vacuum. The initial cost of U.S. ground force involvement is projected at $2.6 billion including an initial $600 million for rebuilding roads, bridges and infrastructure. The cost in American lives tonight is uncertain. This operation is high risk and its ultimate resolution unclear. Thus, before committing U.S. forces, it is critical to ask the Clinton Administration:

Under what Constitutional authority is your Administration committing 20,000 U.S. ground forces to Bosnia and thousands more to adjacent nations?

Under what specific treaty obligation and amended obligations is your Administration committing U.S. ground forces to Bosnia?

Please define peace-keeping.

Please outline the mission in Bosnia and when our nation will know it has succeeded and thus withdraw.

Please define peace-making.

In the past, when, where and through what legal or treaty authority has the U.S. deployed ground forces through NATO, or other European Security institutions for ''peace-keeping'' operations in the former Soviet bloc?

Since the administration's Bosnia initiative is precedent-setting—U.S. ground forces in a former, unstable Soviet nation—on what basis will our forces be committed to other internal civil wars in the future? What will be the U.S. military ''peacekeeping'' relationship to the United Nations, NATO and other such international entities in the future?

Has the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe formally requested NATO assistance in Bosnia? Please provide the document requesting such involvement.

What is the role of the Western European Union, if any, in the Bosnia deployment?

Is Eurocorps functional and what force level has it committed to Bosnia?

Describe the Bosnian Commission that is to settle property disputes and its legal structure. Is it operational? If not, when will it become functional?

How does the United States role in Bosnia differ from our role in Lebanon?

Do the three parties to the peace accord—Presidents Milosevic, Izetbegovic, Tudjamn—represent legitimate authority for their respective constituencies? Through what legal process was each elected to preside over those countries? Please detail the nature of their respective elections.

Finally, why in this post Cold War era—when the U.S. citizenry has been clamoring for more defense-burden sharing by U.S. allies—has the U.S. again been asked to assume the central role in resolving this situation, even convening the peace talks in Dayton, OH, rather than on the European continent.

This matter is a defining moment in U.S. foreign policy in that the U.S. is being asked to substitute for European resolve.

In the NATO nations of Europe we have thousands of European trained, deployable troops that could be dispatched immediately to the Bosnia region in the event a final peace accord is signed in Paris.

Let me read to you the countries and the number of their combat ready troops:

Belgium	63,000
Denmark	27,000
France	409,000
Germany	367,300
Greece	159,300
Italy	322,300
Luxembourg	800
Netherlands	70,900
Norway	33,500
Portugal	50,700
Spain	206,500
Turkey	503,800
United Kingdom	254,300
Total	2,468,400

The Administration states that Europe, since 1914, has been unable to effectively maintain the peace and there was no other recourse but for the U.S. to assume the lead in bringing the warring factions to peaceful resolution. We are urged not to become ''isolationist''.

The truth is the long-term prospects for peace in this troubled region are slim. Once the NATO troops withdraw, it will require 50 years of cooling off between warring factions and maintenance of borders by external forces to give peace a chance, not a one-year quick fix. And who will commit to that? Who will pay for it?

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO].

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the Dornan resolution. At a time when U.S. troops are in the field, right at this very moment, the Dornan resolution would deny American troops the resources they need to carry out their mission.

This is a naked political ploy that, despite all the rhetoric, pulls the rug right out from under the feet of the very troops that most if not all the Members in this body want to support. You cannot have it both ways.

The gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] says there are now 150 troops on the ground. If this bill were to reach the President over the next several days, there would be at least 2,000 troops on the ground before it would be presented to him.

At a time when we already have a significant number of people there; what kind of message does this send, when Members of this Congress act to strip American troops of the resources they need? Could we even evacuate the area of those who have already arrived and will over the next several days be arriving?

□ 1900

I do not believe this bill would permit it. The Dornan resolution represents, I believe, a direct assault on every U.S. soldier on the ground in Bosnia and those who will soon be there. This resolution essentially could take the weapons out of the hands of the troops and put, unfortunately, and maybe unintentionally, our men and women directly in harm's way.

I think we should stop playing politics with the lives of the young men and women who are there. If we really support our troops, there are opportunities ahead to vote for that. There is no question that this bill is not necessary and, in fact, could do a lot of damage. I think it is the height of irresponsibility, and I personally believe this resolution is far too far to the extreme. I believe it is really an attempt to embarrass this President.

But, more importantly, to those of us who will be voting here shortly, I believe it will, in the long run, embarrass those of us who choose to vote for it. I do not intend to be one of them. I think there are other alternatives available to us this evening, whether you are for or against this effort in Bosnia, that have a more effective and less destructive way of expressing the opinion of this Congress.

I wish this resolution had not been presented, but I think those of us who have the courage to stand with our troops need to oppose it.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to remind the gentleman who just spoke that there will be a lot of conscience voting on the other side. I respect that. But I believe all of the leadership over there, including you, voted against Desert Storm and voted against our troops. So let us not inject politics and hypocrisy here. Let us all speak with our brains and our hearts and respect one another.

I looked up how you voted.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SCARBOROUGH].

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I must tell you I am highly offended that the Member from California would call this a naked political ploy, when we in Congress are simply doing what is our constitutional right to do, questioning whether we send young Americans to die in the snows of Bosnia.

I sit on the Committee on National Security; make no mistake of it, every single person that has testified in front of the Committee on National Security has said young Americans will die in that battle. We have that right to ask the question.

How many times have we heard since the end of the Vietnam war, ''Why didn't our leaders step forward earlier and stop it?'' The troops are not in at such a degree that we cannot get them out. We have more Americans in Central America fighting the drug war right now than we have over in Bosnia. We have a right, and for those who say how dare we do it now, these are the same people that were telling us during the Dayton peace talks that we had no right to do it; then that we had to wait until after the Dayton peace talks. Now they are telling us we as Congress do not have the right to do it now.

Let me tell you, if not now, when? And if we do not have the right to do it, then who has the right to stand up and ask the President why he is sending Americans to die in a conflict that his own Secretary of Defense says does not pose a vital threat to America?

The Constitution is clear. James Madison, one of the three drafters of the Constitution, said that the Constitution supposes, with the history of Governments to declare, that the executive branch of power is the most interested in war and the most prone to it. It has, accordingly, with studied care, vested the power of war in the legislature. That was from James Madison to Thomas Jefferson.

I want the Member from California, I want those who vote against the only true bill that can do something to stop the bloodshed now, to tell me during this debate what will they tell the parents of those children who die in Bosnia? What is the reason that we have sent them over there to die? Tell the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BUNNING], what is the vital American interest in sending his son over to die?

These troops are not cowards. People from my district have been over there for months flying missions. We are not isolationists. But tell us the vital American interest that is worth the death of Americans. And make no mistake of it, the President will tell you, the Vice President said it today, as many as 50 Americans will die over there.

So when you vote against Dorman, you are voting to wash your hands of this issue, and if you are comfortable with that, if you feel there is a compelling vital American interest, if you truly believe in your heart that a 500-year-old civil war with no vital American interest, according to our own Secretary of Defense, is worth spilling American blood, that is fine. But convince me, because nobody in the administration has convinced me or 75 percent of Americans that we have a vital American interest over there.

I certainly respect those who will vote against the Dornan amendment. I know this is a highly emotional issue. Nobody has made a case yet that it is worth spilling American blood.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. HINCHEY].

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, for the last 4 years a horrible war has been ranging in the former Yugoslavia. It is a war that, with each passing day threatens to become wider and more dangerous, not just for the people in that country but for other countries in the surrounding region and for the world itself.

Already that war has claimed several hundred thousand lives. There are 2 million refugees in country and another 800,000 refugees outside of country.

On the Serbian side, there are already volunteers, including high-ranking officers, serving with the Serbians from former Soviet-bloc countries. On the Bosnian side, there have been volunteers from other countries, particularly in the Middle East. The war is becoming more dangerous, more complicated and more involved all the time.

A month ago our President invited the leaders of those three countries to come to this country. They sat down in Dayton, and after 3 weeks they signed a peace agreement. The fighting has stopped. Now they ask us to come and stand between them to make sure that the fighting continues to stop while they have an opportunity to rebuild their countries and settle their differences peaceably among themselves. They need NATO.

They said to us, and I was in Bosnia as others of us have been over the last weekend, they told us directly,

> No one can ensure that this happens, that this peace continues, other than NATO, and there is no one that can lead NATO except for the United States. We need the United States. We trust the United States. We respect the United States. We want you to come here and make sure that this peace continues.

Our troops are on their way. They are already now on trains heading for the staging area in lower Hungary. Hundreds of them are on the ground in Tuzla.

This resolution cuts off all funding for American troops in the field. I met with those troops in Frankfurt just yesterday, had lunch with them in the mess hall. What they said to us, from officers down to privates, the two privates that I sat next to in that lunch hall, was this:

> We need the support of the American people. We are going for this mission. We understand it is dangerous. We are prepared for it. Our morale is high. We can do the job, but, don't deprive us, don't deprive us of the means to achieve the objectives that you have set forth for us.

That is what this bill does. Unfortunately, it deprives them precisely and specifically of the means to carry out the mission that they have been sent there to accomplish. It would cut off all of their funding. Let us not do that to them.

We are sending them there on a mission that is dangerous and important for our country, for the NATO countries, and for the rest of the world to keep peace.

More than 60 years ago, a kind of ethnic cleansing swept through Europe. We did not step in in time. Let us not make that mistake again. We are there to maintain this peace. Let us not cut off the funds for the troops who are there to do the job.

Vote ''no'' on Dornan.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOGLIETTA].

Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Speaker, the holiday season is a time for us to count our blessings, and it was in this spirit that I came before the House last week to urge my colleagues to reflect upon the efforts of the peacemakers. I felt that the words found in the Bible expressed it best, ''Blessed are the peacemakers.''

After 3 years of starvation, mass executions, sniper fire, indiscriminate shelling and rape, the children of Sarajevo are ready to enjoy their first Christmas free of fear and violence. For the first time in years, families have an opportunity to share the holidays together without worrying that a father or a son will be dragged off in the dead of night never to be seen again.

In large part, our Nation, our President, its leaders, its diplomats, its men and women in uniform and its people are responsible for this state of affairs.

While I strongly support the humanitarian goals of this mission, I also support this mission because it is in our national interest. Is not preservation of the North Atlantic Alliance, which has kept the peace in Europe for over 40 years, important to America's national security? Is not keeping the war in the Balkans from spreading to engulf our important allies, Turkey and Greece, important to America's national security? The answer is ''yes.''

It is also a national interest to protect the constitutional powers, not just of this President but of future Presidents.

After 3 years, our President and our European allies have finally pulled the warring parties in Bosnia off the battlefield and to the negotiating table to end the bloodshed and death which has claimed the lives of so many innocent women and children.

Mr. Speaker, let us be messengers of peace and goodwill and support. Let us support our troops, America's national interests, our President, and the peacemakers. Let us support the Hamilton amendment.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, blessed are the peacemakers. Peacemakers? Maybe targets.

There is only one vote on the House floor tonight; I am going to vote for Mr. HAMILTON's, but I am going to vote for Mr. SKELTON's and Mr. BUYER's.

They are after-the fact, nonbinding votes. They mean nothing. Yes, there may be 2,000 troops in Bosnia before the Dornan amendment may pass. I do not think it will pass. But if it did, the President would veto it, and we could not override the veto.

Because, Congress, we know our history in Vietnam. What was the sense to it? What was the binding vote that declared war in Southeast Asia? There was none.

Congress does not govern anymore. I hear all of this superpower business. We are not the only power. Europe is not exactly a Third World military pushover, folks.

I want you to just think of this, while our young men and women, while there is no security national security threat in Bosnia, No. 1, and our experts tell us Europe has enough military personnel and money to provide the peace, while our personnel, ground troops, are over in Bosnia, French soldiers will be visiting Disneyland.

This is ridiculous. I keep hearing about NATO. NATO was designed and, in fact, created to prevent a Soviet invasion. It is time for Congress to realign NATO. Let the Europeans put up the big money. Let the Europeans put up the military. Let us support them.

My God, this is contained, and if we needed to send troops, if it would be exported out of Bosnia, we could send ground troops.

This is the only vote you have. These other votes have absolutely no meaning. I am going to vote for them, but you have just given the authority to declare war to one person, the President. I do not want to hurt the President. But it is not the President's authority to do this. By God, if we do not challenge it over Bosnia, we will continue to look in our history, at Vietnam, Bosnia, Beirut, Lebanon, Somalia. What is next here?

Wise up, Congress.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS], the distinguished deputy whip.

□ 1915

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I urge may colleagues to support the peace agreement between the warring parties of Bosnia. Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God.

This was not an easy decision for the President. This is not an easy vote for any of us. It is not popular, and it is not easy. But we are leaders. We are not called to do what is popular, to put our fingers to the wind is blowing. Our mission, our responsibility is to do what is right.

For 3 years, we have heard the cries of anguish from the people of Bosnia. We have been deeply troubled by the accounts of rape, torture, and murder. We wanted to help stop the violence, stop the fighting. But we did not want to get involved in a war that seemed to have no end.

But now—finally—we have an opportunity to support peace. This mission is not for war. It is not Vietnam. It is a mission to uphold the peace.

Only yesterday, the Prime Minister of Israel thanked America for leading the way. For fighting fascism and championing democracy. He urged us to continue our leadership, not just in the Middle East, but elsewhere, in places where our leadership—American leadership—can make a difference. America has always stood for peace and freedom because it is right.

If we fail to act, we lose our moral compass. We lose our sense of purpose, our sense of direction as a great nation.

We now live in a global village. What happens in Bosnia affects people in Boston, in Chicago, in Detroit and in Atlanta.

But I believe—I truly believe—we cannot, we must not stand idly by. To do so would undermine our position in NATO and throughout the world. Our involvement can make the difference between war and peace, between death and life.

How in God's name can we stand by? We have seen the ethnic cleansing, the slaughter of young children, and the rape of women. More than 250,000 people have lost their lives. More than 2 million people have been uprooted and made refugees.

If we fail to respond to the Macedonian call—to lend a helping hand for those in trouble—then the cycle of violence will continue.

At long last, we can make a difference—to give peace a chance. I plead with you my colleagues—stand with us. Stand with our troops. Stand up for what is right and just. Support our mission for peace. Oppose this amendment, support Hamilton.

Blessed are the peacemakers, Mr. Speaker, for they shall be called the children of God.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, since communism killed more people in Cambodia, Laos, and Vietnam than the entire population of Bosnia and Herzegovina, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas, Mr. SAM JOHNSON.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this is not about peace and war; it is about war. That is what is going on over there, and they are not going to stop fighting just because we go in there.

I wholeheartedly support withholding funds from President Clinton's Bosnia mission. Although it is a drastic step and ties the President's hands, I do not feel like we have any other choice. The President has tied our hands, gone against the wishes of the American people, and this is the last best way I know how to show my respect for our American servicemen and women. They are helpless, following orders. But we, we are in a position to stop this terrible mistake before it happens.

I know how those soldiers are feeling. I was in the military for 29 years, and I recognize that we used to say ''Let's go to war. Let's go fight that war, it is the only one we have got.'' And that is what some of them are doing. However, I was told by Senator HUTCHISON that the guys down in Fort Hood did not say that. They said ''Why are we going there? Can't you stop us?'' She said she would try.

Thirty years ago when I was sent to Vietnam in a similar situation, Vietnam started out as a peace type mission, no defined goal, no exit strategy, no idea whose side we were on, and a created incident to gain support of the Congress. A peacekeeping mission? Come on. Does this not sound just like a carbon copy? I think it is.

What is going to happen when our guys get over there, and if the rules of engagement apply, and they get shot at, and we start shooting back, what are their people going to say when we start killing them, killing Bosnians, killing Croatians, killing Serbs? We will do it, and we will get chastised for it.

Let me just ask one more thing for the guys over here voting against it: What are you going to do when one of our women soldiers get captured?

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS.]

(Mr. OWENS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Dornan amendment. There is no more noble a purpose and no more practical a purpose for the use of American military strength than the purpose for which the troops are being deployed in Bosnia. Blessed are the peacemakers and peacekeepers. All armies are created and mobilized for the purpose of achieving peace. Troops fight to win wars in order to realize peace. To conquer an enemy is to achieve peace.

If peace is always the objective, then why do we belittle and challenge a use of American troops to maintain the peace in a situation where peace has been negotiated? Every soldier who serves in Bosnia should be saluted as a hero. The soldiers who keep the peace deserve all the medals and as much glory as the soldiers who fight hot wars.

Peace is always the objective of honorable military action. Certainly there are great risks. From day one in training camp, every soldier enters a world where risks are far greater than in the civilian world. In any foreign theater, a soldier's risks are greatly increased. But in Bosnia the risks are being taken to feed the hungry, to clothe the naked, and to provide shelter for those who have been made homeless over and over again by the actions of military criminals.

We spend nearly $250 billion a year to maintain the world's greatest military force. The American armed forces of 1995 should be declared an Army for peace. For all the years to come it should be understood that we are armed to promote and preserve peace. Bosnia should not be seen as a waste. The deployment of troops in Bosnia is a necessity to send a message to the military criminals of the world that thugs will not be allowed to rule any part of the world and go unchallenged.

American soldiers should not be asked again and again to do this in the world, but this is a clear and present situation. This is a situation that has been negotiated. This is a situation where peace is achievable. Let our Army help to achieve that peace.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN].

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, imagine for a moment that you are an American soldier who said good-bye to his family and you are on your way to Bosnia. Word reaches you tonight that the Dornan resolution has passed in the U.S. House of Representatives. The House of Representatives has voted to cut off all funds for Bosnian peacekeeping.

The gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] knows and everyone knows on this floor his resolution will not go any further than this House of Representatives, but it will reach these troops on their way to represent America.

This is a cruel resolution. It will say to the men and women whom we ask to wake up tomorrow to dress in their military uniform and to represent the United States that we do not stand behind them.

I think we have learned many lessons through our lifetime. We have certainly learned that when we have made the commitment to put our troops in the field, we in the United States Congress must stand behind them.

The gentleman from California likes to recount the fact that many of us voted against the Persian Gulf war. I did. The gentleman should also recount the fact that immediately thereafter there was offered a bipartisan resolution, which passed I believe without a dissenting vote, where we stood resolutely behind those men and women, regardless of our vote on the Persian Gulf war. That was the appropriate and proper thing for us to do as Americans.

Regardless of the fact that I do disagree with some aspects of this Bosnian peacekeeping, I think the President was wrong in not seeking Congressional approval, the fact is the troops are committed. The fact is they will look to us, Mr. DORNAN, and they will look to you as to whether you support them. And your answer to them is not a badge you wear on your lapel or any fancy ribbon that you wear on your suit, but how Members will vote.

Mr. Speaker, I hope Members will join me in voting to make sure those men and women in the field know that we stand behind them. This is serious, it is a serious commitment of this country. These men and women are putting their lives on the line. We owe it to them to take it very seriously. I urge my colleagues, whether you agree with the President or not, to defeat this cruel Dornan resolution.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I will not be goated yet. Mr. Speaker, my 22 years and 4 months in the Air force prevents me from rising to that fight.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Idaho, Mrs. HELEN CHENOWETH, a freshman who has just come back from a recent trip to Sarajevo.

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear that the Dornan resolution and the resolutions and bills that we have passed already in this Congress is not a message to our boys who are preparing to be deployed. It is

a message to our boys who are preparing to be deployed. It is a message to the President of the United States, who is acting like a dictator. When is he going to get the message?

Mr. Speaker, yes, I was in Sarajevo, and I sat with Prime Minister Siladjic, who said very clearly, we have not asked for your troops. We have only asked that the arms embargo be lifted. We do not want to be an occupied nation. We want to be able to defend ourselves. We want to have military parity.

Mr. Speaker, they will only be able to have peace over there when everyone is equally armed. Let us not make a cheap political trick out of this by distorting the issue and using our boys in a political discourse. We are behind our men and women who will be deployed. There is no doubt about that. But, again, the Congress is saying no to President Clinton.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS].

(Mr. DICKS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to urge my colleagues tonight to think of the troops that we have in the process of deploying to Bosnia. I think a resolution that would cut off all money for ground forces would be widely misunderstood with the troops in the field, and I think would be a tragic mistake in undercutting of the U.S. presidency and of the Dayton agreement.

I would hope that my colleagues would give President Clinton what he needs tonight, and that is a resolution which strongly supports the troops, strongly supports the men and women who will be going to Bosnia, and I think the Hamilton resolution gives us that exact message and is what this Congress should rally behind.

I do remember the gulf war debate. After that debate was finished, we had a bipartisan effort to support the troops. I might recall to my friends on the other side, Speaker Foley did not call for a vote on this until after 500,000 troops were deployed to the gulf war. That was an appropriate time to do this. But to take this hard approach, to cut off all money, no money shall be spent, I think would be a terrible mistake. I think it would weaken the presidency, it will weaken our leadership in the world, it will weaken NATO and our leadership of NATO, and I think it is one of the most serious mistakes we will have made in this Congress.

So, again, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the Dornan amendment and support Hamilton, which is well written and very supportive of the men and women who will be serving us so well in the Persian Gulf.

□ 1930

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina, [Mr. FUNDERBURK], the Member of this House or the Senate who spent the most time on the ground, 4 years in Romania, as Ambassador FUNDERBURK.

Mr. FUNDERBURK. Mr. Speaker, 1 year in Bosnia's 600 year old war and out, and peace is to be permanently established? What a joke. U.S. leadership is at stake in the world? What a joke. NATO will collapse if we do not go? World War III? What a joke.

U.S. troops must be supported. True, we all agree, but the President can send troops anywhere and then say if we do not support this unilateral Federal Executive action we are not for our troops. Shame on the one who never supported our troops until he was Commander-in-Chief, and until he seeks leadership credentials. He should have tried getting support of the American people and Congress first, before he committed.

Mr. Speaker, saying our mission was a moral imperative are hollow words coming from people who, for the last 30 years, have turned a blind eye to atrocities in Cambodia, Vietnam, China, Romania, Iraq, and Syria. What about America's moral imperative to intervene in Bosnia? Bosnia is a nightmare, but why should American soldiers stop at Bosnia? Why not Sri Lanka, Peru, China, Nigeria, Indonesia, the Sudan, the Philippines, Western Sahara, Afghanistan, Algeria, wherever there is blood and fighting? The list is endless.

Our policy has always been and it must be to selectively engage our forces where we can do the most good but with the goal of protecting the national security of the United States. On those grounds, Bosnia misses the mark. We have no interest there, plain and simple.

I have lived in that part of the world, the sad part. The Dayton peace accord is a prescription for disaster. Its Byzantine arrangement of one Bosnia with two governments and three independent armies is farcical. Margaret Thatcher had it right when she said the best thing we can do in the Balkans is arm the Moslems and stay out of the direct fight.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support our only option here tonight for the Congress and the people, the Dornan bill.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON].

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I intend to vote against the Dornan bill. I do so because I feel to support it would be a vote in favor of cutting our troops off at the knees. They are on their way. They are going to be there.

Mr. Speaker, in a later moment I will explain, in great detail, problems that I have with the U.S. policy, but this is not the time nor the moment to do that. I will explain why we should vote for the Buyer-Skelton resolution, which will put this entire matter in perspective.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to say that I appreciate my good friend, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], setting the standard here. There are so many distinguished people on his side and mine that want to speak, and so I am going to limit all my speakers to 30 seconds so that everybody gets a chance to be heard on this, and then they may join my special order tonight for an hour to extend their remarks. Let us give it our best shot on both sides.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TIAHRT].

(Mr. TIAHRT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, it is very clear our troops understand what is going on. I talked to them on my way back from Bosnia. They know it is our job to argue policy, and by supporting the Dornan resolution it does not cut them off at the knees. It is shameless to say that it does.

Our troops took an oath to defend the Constitution and our borders, and we have extended that to America's vital interests across this world, but none of that is here in Bosnia. None of it. We are asking them to go above and beyond the call of duty, outside what they have taken an oath and sworn to do. I think we should realize that.

I am carrying a coin, and I am going to keep the First Armored Division in mind for 12 months. And I hope the guy that gave me this does not come back in a coffin.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY], who was discussed at great length on the Senate Floor today.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, I think it is disgraceful that Members would get up in the well of this House and talk about cutting the knees out from under our troops. No one wants to hurt the troops. No one wants to hurt the troops. We want to get the troops there out, and we do not want to send any more troops.

When we debated Hefley back before Thanksgiving, the Democrats said it is a good idea but it was not the right time. Now they say this is not the right time because the troops are already there. When is the right time to say, Mr. Clinton, this is a stupid idea and we do not want you to do it?

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BECERRA].

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I approach this with some trepidation. I have never been one who likes to use our American troops to do things outside of what is absolutely necessary for the protection of this country. I take a look at this and I ask myself did we get the best deal for the troops that are being sent out there? Is this really the peace accord that is the mother of peace accords, that will guarantee us that the parties will finally agree to what they

have said? I ask if those paramilitary forces that are out there, under the control of no one, are really going to be stopped? And I ask do we really know how we will get our troops out should this operation fail

At the same time, I know what I do not want to send a signal to the men and women who are going to Bosnia that I am not prepared to support them. Mr. Speaker, as I look at this vote, and I weigh the chance that I am sending people that are like me, in their thirties and twenties and forties, to go face off with people that we have never seen before, I do this with some trepidation.

I will probably support the Hamilton resolution. I cannot, in good conscience, support the Dornan resolution, and I would urge all the Members to not support the Dornan resolution. What we must do is do the right thing for those that are going. And I do not believe, at this stage, we can say that cutting off funds is the way we want to send our troops to Bosnia.

So I would urge Members to consider the fact this is them going. This is our chance to tell them that we support them, because they have no choice but to go, and it is our opportunity to say we will live up to our responsibility to do the right thing.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOSTETTLER].

(Mr. HOSTETTLER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOSTETTLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Dornan resolution.

Article 1, section 8 clearly enumerates the powers of the U.S. Congress and it clearly lays forth the power of the Congress to make rules for the regulation and the government of land and naval forces. It speaks very limited to the power of the President as Commander in Chief.

It is time to end the concession of this Congress to the executive branch in matters of policy as relates to the military. Support the Dornan language.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN].

(Mr. NEUMANN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Speaker, 30 seconds is a very short amount of time to say how I feel on this. But let me make a couple of things perfectly clear. I am 100-percent supportive of our troops. It is the policy and the idea of our troops risking their lives without our national interest at stake that I am opposed to.

So the message out of here, in 30 short seconds: We support our troops 100 percent; we do not want them in Bosnia. We have sent this message early in the summer, in the middle of the summer, late in the summer, again this fall. In case the President does not get it yet, we do not want our troops in Bosnia; we do not want our young people to lose their lives in Bosnia.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUNNING). The gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, Mr. STEVE CHABOT.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I am not convinced that the deployment of our brave soldiers in Bosnia will accomplish any lasting purpose other than to have put valiant American men and women in harm's way in a centuries-old civil war.

I will support the troops once they are there, but I want to state, in the strongest possible terms, that those troops should not be sent to Bosnia in the first place.

I am concerned that one of two things will happen. President Clinton says they will be out in 1 year. Either they will come back in 1 year and the bloodshed will begin anew, or they will be over there for a long, long time; and that is not acceptable to the American people, and it is not acceptable to me.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Long Beach, CA, Mr. STEVE HORN, who went over there 5 times as a professor to try to convince them to vote instead of kill one another.

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

This is not a partisan issue. Anyone that says we are not supporting the troops has to be either a rogue or a scoundrel. That is utter nonsense. This is a constitutional issue; this is an institutional issue. The House of Representatives must authorize the money.

This is not England. This is not the Roman Empire. This is not some dictatorship. If we have Presidents of both parties, and that is true, that have roamed the world in election years to look better rather than grapple with the problems at home, let us tell them that they must start here for the authority. They have no authority as Commander in Chief.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, I am not a war hero and so I cannot stand here with any credibility that might in any way match some of my colleagues, one of whom is proposing this resolution. I am however an American, and I am a human being and a supporter of world peace.

I am a mother as well, and I had the opportunity just this past week to talk to some of the parents of some of the troops who are now in Germany, prepared to liberate those in the former Yugoslavia and Croatia and Bosnia.

What I am, however, is an expert on life and the quality of life and what it means to live in a democracy. I would venture to say that the wrongest resolution we could ever have is the one that is on the floor right now: Cutting off the money, telling our troops we do not care, and simply saying to people who want peace, ''The heck with you.''

I do not know if we are aware of the human suffering that has gone on in Bosnia, some 3.2 million refugees, 200,000 dead, 6,000 elderly; homeless, and the mass graves that USA Today indicated, where dozens of family members gathered in the morgue of Splits Clinical Hospital to try to identify remains of loved ones, including watches, crucifixes, and pieces of clothing found with the bodies.

The article reveals that a BMW car key found on body number 28 was given to a woman who claims her husband, hotel manager Steko, age 33, had a similar car. The woman, Bozana Steko, 32, races home to see if the car starts, and it does.

I am not sure what we are debating here. I did not have the privilege to rise to the House floor and debate whether or not we should have gone into Kuwait when we had a Republican President. But I know there are many of my colleagues here that rose with all articulateness and emotional fervor, saying there was a reason to go to Kuwait. As a Texan, I know that we were talking about oil.

□ 1945

Today, Mr. Speaker, we are talking about peace. The American people have never run away from peace. They have run away from the loss of human life and the memories of Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, this is not Vietnam. We have a military that is enormously prepared. We have young soldiers who are committed to the principles of peace. We have a strategy of rules of engagement that allows our troops to shoot to kill. We do not have sitting ducks at the line of demarcation. We are sending armored divisions, and yes the Americans are in areas that they know they can cover.

There are those who are cynical. There will be dangers, sniper fire, possibilities of land mines, but Americans and people of the world have never been able to gain peace without taking risks.

But most of all, I would say to my colleagues who want to throw in the faces of our troops that we will cut off the money but yet, we are for you, as I have heard my colleagues say, I want them to simply tell the truth. If my colleagues are for peace, they have got to stand for peace. They have got to take risks for peace.

Having gone to Bosnia, I will tell my colleagues that the people there want peace. They want to be part of peace. They begged us for peace as we stood in the streets with Bosnian children.

Mr. Speaker, this is the wrong way to go. We must support our troops. We must be strong for peace. Let us act like Americans. Take a risk and take a stand. Stand strong for peace.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE] who has one of the best chiefs of staff on the Hill.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, this is not so complex. Our troops are not in Bosnia. Our troops are in Germany. If my colleagues want our troops to stay in Germany and not go to Bosnia because this policy is wrong, dead wrong, this vote tonight is the only opportunity to do that.

If this vote passes by two-thirds of this House and two-thirds in the other body, it is veto-proof. It is the only opportunity that we have, with 66 percent of these two bodies acting out the will of 85 percent of the American people, to prevent this travesty from happening.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, we have only one remaining speaker, and I will yield the balance of my time to him. I understand the gentleman from California has the right to close.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BARTLETT], a scholar.

(Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, with the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] leading this effort, it is patently ridiculous to assert that this vote could be construed as a statement for nonsupport for our troops. Please do not use this argument. With Mr. DORNAN leading this debate, there is no way our intentions could be misunderstood.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER].

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, the White House and the public will take a vote against Dornan as a vote for Gulf of Tonkin-like powers for a Presidential deployment of American troops to Bosnia. That is what this debate is all about.

Should we give the President the power to send these troops to Bosnia? If some nut or ruthless gang unleashes biological or chemical weapons or in some other way kills hundreds if not thousands of young American defenders, those opposed to this bill will bear a share of the responsibility with the President.

The President is sending them there. We have a chance to act. We are now in the chain of command. If my colleagues vote against the Dornan proposal, they are sending a message to the President that he can send the troops to the Balkans.

The cold war is over. The American people deserve better treatment than this. We should not be sending young Americans all over the world in every conflict. It is not fair to them. It is not good policy, and it will not lead to a more peaceful world.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH].

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult in a half-minute to sum up all the arguments. Suffice it to say, clearly and unequivocally, we stand in support of our American troops. It is for that reason that we do not ask those troops to put on referee stripes to go and try to mediate a peace that is not a reality.

We call in American fighting men and women to defend this country and our legitimate national interests. There are no legitimate national interests at stake in Bosnia. Mark Twain said it best, Mr. Speaker: History does not repeat itself, but it rhymes.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON].

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, Winston Churchill said that nothing that ever starts in the Balkans ever ends there. I think that when we think about making peace with tanks, bullets, guns, rifles, and missiles, we are not fooling ourselves. We are not going over there to make peace. We are going to go in there and prolong and probably start a bigger conflict than has been going on there already for over 100 years.

So, I proudly support the Dornan amendment and will say this: If anybody thinks there is a Member of Congress who cares about our men and women in armed services more than the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN], they are only fooling themselves.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD], just back from Sarajevo and all points thereabouts.

(Mr. PACKARD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution. It is the only way that I can express my view and the overwhelming views of my constituents to our President. The best way to support our troops is to not send them at all.

Mr. Speaker, the President's policy to send United States troops to Bosnia is simply wrong. I have recently returned from Bosnia and I can tell my colleagues firsthand that the situation there is grave. The destruction that I witnessed is horrifying.

We will not have peace in Bosnia with or without our troops, in my judgment. I opposed the President's policy before I went to Bosnia, and I oppose it more even after returning.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] has 3½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. NORWOOD], someone who not only supports the troops; he is one of the troops, a Vietnam veteran.

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight with a troubled heart. I rise tonight to ask my colleagues to support our troops. Support them by bringing the 150 home. Bring them home now, before we get into a mess like I personally had to live through 30 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, I served one ''Mission Impossible'' in Vietnam where we waged political war and no one really knew who the enemy was, and we had no political will to flight. Let us stop this madness. Is it not better we embarrass the President than to lose one American life?

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SCHIFF], a member of our conference who just made First Bird Eagle Colonel.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, there is a vital U.S. interest in peace in Europe, but there is more of an interest in peace in Europe to the Europeans. The case has never been made as to why the Europeans cannot themselves send 60,000 ground troops to quell the situation in Bosnia. No case has been made why U.S. troops are needed to help them.

Mr. Speaker, just because we are a superpower should not make us a superpatsy to do the Europeans' job for them. If there is a threat that the war will spread further in Europe, that is even more of a reason for the Europeans to supply the ground troops themselves.

Mr. Speaker, the best way to support our troops is not to send them to Bosnia in the first place.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, even if I only save 30 seconds for myself, does that mean that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA], this very distinguished Marine, once and forever, gets to go right before me, or could I ask the gentleman to speak now?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. No, the gentleman from Pennsylvania could be yeilded to speak now. It depends.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH], a senior Member and a chairman of the Subcommittee on International Economic Policy and Trade.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, these things never change. I have been in many of these debates. The American people are always conned. That is the truth of it, and that is happening again tonight.

Mr. Speaker, a year from now, I want to predict what is going to happen. When there are yellow ribbons all over America and the American people say, ''When are our boys going to come home,'' these people are going to say, ''We cannot leave now. Look what is going to happen to NATO. Who is going to take care of the American sector? It is going to be war all over again.''

Mr. Speaker, if we move in tonight, we are going to be there for a good long time, and all of my colleagues know it.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. HERGER].

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, this so called mission is not—as the President would have us think—a peacekeping mission—this is a peacemaking mission. How can we commit our troops to

keep a peace that does not even exist? Why should U.S. blood be spilled for a cause that is not in the interest of the American people?

Mr. Speaker, what will we tell these brave soldiers' parents that their children died for? Remember the lessons of Somalia and Beirut. Vote for the Dornan bill.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARR].

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, every once in a great while there is a policy that is so misguided, so ill-conceived, so poorly planned, and so deceptively presented to the American people that drastic measures are called for. The Bosnian policy pursued by this Presidency unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, falls directly into that category, and there is only one way to stop it.

Mr. Speaker, there is only one thing to do and that is to pass a bill that has some teeth in it. Not just mere words; some teeth in it. That is what the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] has presented here this evening, and that is what we must do in order to stop this misguided and ill-conceived policy now.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Washington [Mr. METCALF].

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, there are no vital United States interests threatened in Bosnia. Sad experience has taught us that it is real easy to move in the troops, it is very difficult to accomplish the objective after we are in there, and extremely difficult to get out in a timely and honorable way.

We must do everything possible, and that is what we are doing now, to prevent this folly before the signing, before the decision is irrevocable.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO].

(Mr. DEFAZIO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Dornan proposal.

Mr. Speaker, I stand in reluctant opposition to the legislation by the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] to cut off funding for United States armed forces already on the ground in the territory of the former Yugoslavia.

The basic problem is this: the President has already placed United States troops on the ground in Bosnia. That is a fact, though I maintain that he had no proper constitutional authority to do so without advance congressional authorization. But despite my opposition to this policy, I believe we owe those troops our support and our blessing. Therefore, in this instance, I will reluctantly oppose Mr. DORNAN's resolution and support the resolution offered by Mr. BUYER which once again expresses our disapproval of the President's policy, but stands behind the well-being and safety of our young men and women in the Armed Forces.

The sorry chain of events leading up to this vote only serves to underscore the need to revamp the legal relationship between the White House and Congress in matters of war and peace. I've introduced legislation to reassert Congress' constitutional authority to place troops into war or warlike situations. The key to my legislation is a binding requirement for prior congressional authorization for the use of U.S. forces in hostilities except in those cases where the President must act to protect the United States, its troops, citizens, or territories abroad. Until we in Congress act to reaffirm our prerogatives, we will find ourselves faced with this kind of HOBSON's choice again and again.

Frankly, I do not believe this peace accord will succeed in the long run, though I pray it will at least stop the blood letting for awhile. We are dealing here with an ethnic and religious war that is hundreds of years old. The best intentions of the Western powers are not likely to cool the flames of hatred in the region.

Furthermore, our Nation should not assume the lion's share of the financial burden and military risk in this attempt to bring peace to the former Yugoslavia. For more than 40 years, the United States has provided for the security of Europe. We have spent as much as $100 billion each year to protect the European democracies from the threats posed by the Soviet Union and its Warsaw Pact allies. It's time for the European community to own up to its responsibilities and take up its share of the burden.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA].

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, a year ago we stood on the floor and we debated the Haiti resolution. This House had a very good debate on deploying United States forces to Haiti. We heard the same kind of concerns. We heard that people were going to come back in body bags. We heard all kinds of recriminations about the policy, about the United States deployment, about the ability of the United States Commander in Chief to put United States forces in Haiti.

□ 2000

Not long ago, I became concerned about what was going on in Haiti. I went down there on Saturday. I found out that Aristide is going to step aside. They are going to have an election, that the human rights violations have receded substantially, that the 22,000 troops we had there at one time have been reduced to 2,500. In 2½ months we will have all the troops, all the United States forces out of Haiti, and we will not have had one casualty.

Now, will it be a long-term success? All we did was allow them to have an opportunity to have a free election and to get their country in order. It will take a long time for them to straighten this out.

I have been involved in the Bosnia situation for almost 4 years. When the Bush administration was in their last year, I went to Sarajevo. I could not get from the airport into town because the shelling was so heavy. The shells were landing in the houses. Two young children were killed not far from where I was. The next time I went in, I stopped at the location where 70 people were killed with one mortar shell in town. The people were in disarray. The buildings were destroyed. There was no heat, no electricity, and the people did not know where to go. The British commander, General Rose, said to me, stay out of it. We can handle it. The U.S. forces do not need to be involved. And I listened to that.

I told President Clinton that I did not think we should be involved as long as the fighting is going on; I adamantly opposed any U.S. intervention. I did not think we had any business going in as long as they were fighting.

Then the President took a real risk. A year later, I went over and talked to Gen. Rupert Smith. He thought it was time that something could happen there. Our emissaries went to Bosnia. Our emissaries talked to all the parties, and they did a marvelous job. I do not have the highest regard for the State Department, but in this particular case, they did a marvelous job in getting the parties to agree to a cease-fire, which has held for a period of time.

When I was there, I saw every single building in Sarajevo had been destroyed or in some way hit by shellfire. People were starting to feel better about what had happened. And the British commander said, we cannot do it. Only the Americans can cause peace in Bosnia. The British and the French and the Germans have to many long-term animosities. If you want stability in Europe, you are going to have to have American troops involved.

I still doubted it. I still had concerns. I believed there had to be a peace agreement where the troops withdrew. I felt the Russians had to be involved. I thought the terrorists had to be pushed out. And all those things have been agreed to.

Now we stand on the threshold of a very serious decision by the United States Congress, very similar to what we did in Saudi Arabia with a difference. We were going to war in Saudi Arabia. We are going to make peace in Bosnia.

I do not think that any of us take it lightly. I have no concerns about the patriotism of the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] or his feeling or anybody else's motives in why they believe that they should vote one way or the other. But there is no question in my mind that if the United States is not involved, that if we do not take the chance, and I sat down with the President of the United States for an hour and a half and with my year in Vietnam, with my different experiences in the Congress of the United States, like the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], wounded twice when I was over there, I know something about the fighting. I know how difficult it is. But the President listened to my objections and concerns. I told him of the military concerns. I told him that politically he could be making the biggest mistake of his

Presidential career. And I said, I do not expect you to make this decision based on politics. I would hope you would make it based on what is right and wrong, but I am just telling you the danger you are getting involved in.

He listened to me and obviously made what he considered was the right decision as the Commander in Chief.

There is no one in this country that I have a greater regard for than the majority leader of the U.S. Senate or the other body, no one who has taken a more courageous position in this incident, even though he has the same concerns that every person in here has about putting American troops in harm's way. But he made a decision based on the American commitment.

The President of the United States made a very tough decision, a decision he considered was right, a decision he considered was in the best interest of this country. It behooves us not to undercut that President as he goes forward to sign or to agree or to witness a peace treaty by the participants who have been fighting.

No question we will have casualties. But I would ask all of my colleagues to think about the involvement of the United States in world affairs. We cannot be the policemen of the world, but we can, when we see an opportunity, exert our moral force and insert our troops, who are so well trained, to do a job to make peace and not war.

I would urge my colleagues not to cut off the funds for these valiant troops who are on their way to Bosnia at this very minute. Defeat my good friend's amendment. Vote down the Dornan bill and vote for the support of the troops later on.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, a word to my dear friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA]. In the streets of Kuwait City a week after the war eight of us had people come up to us and thank us for bringing peace to Kuwait. And they watched our debate from their hidden rooftop antenna on this House floor, amazing. We brought peace there.

This is the gold mother, the gold widow, the child who loses a dad in the snow of Sarajevo, Tuzla forever. Vote for the gold mother vote.

If I were a Democrat, I would vote for all three. If I were a Republican, and I am, I would vote for mine and then I would vote to support the troops, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BUYER] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON], my pal.

This is a tough vote. I will respect whatever Members do on either side. But believe me, history is going to come back to bite us on this one. We are going to be asked to account for our votes on December 13, 1995.

Good luck. Vote your conscience.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of President Clinton's Bosnia peace initiative. This evening the U.S. House of Representatives debated several legislative measures addressing the issue of President Clinton's deployment of peacekeeping troops to Bosnia. I do not believe that it is constructive for the Congress of the United States to undermine the authority of the President and the confidence of our troops on the ground by challenging the powers granted to the President under the Constitution of the United States.

Though I will always be wary of the deployment of American troops overseas I am confident that President Clinton has exercised his prerogative and authority under the Constitution of the United States to deploy American troops to Bosnia as part of an international peacekeeping force.

Mr. Speaker, during my tenure in Congress, I have been consistent in my opposition and votes against the deployment of American troops in places such as the Persian Gulf and Grenada for the purposes of combat. The circumstances in Bosnia, however, warrant unique consideration of U.S. involvement.

The President has made it clear that the mission of the peace implementation for [IFOR] under the command of NATO is well defined and limited. American forces will be under American command, the deployment has a clear exit strategy and the mission will be limited to the implementation of the historic Dayton Peace Agreement.

Because of the peace mission the President is implementing and because of our strategy of integration, the entire continent can share the blessings of peace that unite our community of free nations. As we strive with our partners to overcome the division in Bosnia, we can also help overcome the remaining division of Europe. Bosnia, once the symbol of Europe's post-cold war disintegration and holocaust, can be the proving ground for a broader and deeper transatlantic community.

Today, we know the extent of war crimes committed against innocent human beings in Bosnia. The atrocities are particularly disturbing when we consider the children of Bosnia and those who know no safe refuge. Finally, thanks to the leadership of President Clinton we are presented with an Opportunity to ameliorate a horrific situation. American leadership will clearly saves the lives of many of Bosnia's innocents that would have surely perished without our help. Hopefully, this peace effort will restore stability to their lives.

The President took a historic step when he invited the Balkans leaders to the Dayton peace talks. At that conference, the parties agreed to pursue peace as opposed to war. In light of this pivotal development, I deem it important that we support President Clinton's peacekeeping initiative and support the American troops who are on foreign soil as part of an international peacekeeping force.

Mr. Speaker, in Cleveland and communities throughout the Nation, our hearts and prayers are with our men and women in uniform and their families. The world will always remember their unselfish dedication to this peacekeeping challenge.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, with our troops on the move, and our national commitment clear, we cannot, should not, vote to cut off the funding of our military.

To do so would both abandon our men and women who are under arms and negate our world leadership.

Thus, I will vote to support our efforts; Concerned? Yes! Determined to preserve our strength? Always!

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Dornan bill which prohibits funding for the deployment of United States armed forces on the ground in the Republic of Bosnia.

Tomorrow the Presidents of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, and Serbia will sign the Dayton peace agreement which assumes the commitment of 60,000 NATO troops to implement its provisions. At least 20,000 of those troops will be American soldiers. Advance troops have already been sent into Bosnia, and the President has said that the troops are committed regardless of whether Congress grants its approval.

For 2½ years President Clinton turned his back on his campaign promises to take decisive action against the aggressors, and his administration further compounded the flawed policy—which had begun in the Bush administration—when it failed to focus, in a meaningful way, on the conflict and the atrocities, and the pleas of the Bosnian Government to permit the means to protect themselves. In fact, I introduced the legislation calling for the unilateral lifting of the embargo against Bosnia. A similar bill, the Bosnia and Herzegovina Self-Defense Act of 1995, was overwhelmingly supported in both the House and Senate. The President chose to veto the bill on August 11.

The Dayton agreement—with the commitment of troops embedded into its fiber—has become the President's answer to the dilemma in the former Yugoslavia. Mr. Speaker, the President left no alternatives for the American people and the Congress.

The President prematurely made commitments to send U.S. troops to Bosnia, first to enforce the Vance-Owen plan, then the Vance-Stoltenberg plan, then the Contact Group plan, then the evacuation of UNPROFOR, and now the Dayton agreement. The President raised the expectations of our allies as well as those of the parties to the conflict that American ground forces would indeed be deployed in Bosnia.

Mr. Speaker, I am not prepared to approve the deployment of our ground troops to this mission.

The White House asserts that failure to deploy ground troops would have serious consequences for our status as a leading force in the world. Perhaps, but any loss of prestige is a consequence the record shows of the President's hasty promise and eagerness to deploy U.S. ground troops to enforce any plan. The premature withdrawal of troops—either in response to military losses or simply in compliance with the convenient time frame set by the administration—without completing a realizable mission is damaging to the morale of the American military forces and the credibility of the United States. Questions remain about the agreement the troops are being sent to implement. Details about how and who will train and provide arms to the Bosnians are being provided piecemeal with the latest understanding being provided in a letter from the President. Will there be a clear delineation between the role of the NATO forces and the agreement's assurances of creating a climate conducive to elections, the return of refugees to their homes and reconstruction of the region?

The President has prematurely committed our troops without providing the Congress and the American people enough confidence that the military strategy has been thoroughly examined, defined and structured. Therefore, I

feel I must vote in favor of H.R. 2707 prohibiting the deployment of U.S. ground forces to Bosnia.

Mr. FLANAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN]. Before I begin, however, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FUNDERBURK], our former Ambassador to Romania.

President Clinton gave a speech before the American people November 27, 1995. He did not make a compelling case for sending United States ground troops into Bosnia. I do not believe that American interests are at stake or that our national security is being threatened in Bosnia. Therefore, I do not agree with the President's decision to send American troops into Bosnia-Herzegovina.

As a veteran of 5 years of active duty as a combat arms army officer, I am well aware of the risks associated with the deployment of a large force into a hostile environment. Our sons and daughters and brothers and sisters in the military are an extraordinary resource that we must not place at needless risk.

Some say America's international prestige is on the line, and that if we do not send the troops it will be diminished in the eyes of the world. But, I believe that our prestige will be weakened much more if young American men and women start coming home as fallen victims of a failed and poorly outlined foreign policy.

The situation in Bosnia-Herzegovina is deplorable, but the basic fact remains that America's vital interests are in no way threatened by that internal conflict. Allowing our young men and women to fight and die for anything less than our vital interests is immoral and reprehensible and I will not support it.

When the loved ones of those who will have needlessly given their lives for the Bosnia mission come to see us, will we honestly be able to tell them that their loved one sacrificed their life on a mission which served a noble purpose and that they did not die in vain? Can we tell them that their sacrifice advanced the cause of world freedom? Can we tell them that their effort was absolutely vital in protecting the security interests of our great Republic? We all know the true answer to these questions.

The administration has yet to really define America's mission in Bosnia, including a detailed explanation of why it would serve our national security interest. No such definition has been forthcoming, nor is one likely to be, in my opinion.

The situation in Bosnia strikes me as being a lot like the situation preceding the Lebanon fiasco of the early 1980's where over 200 young marines lost their lives in a hopeless crusade for peace when one of the chief belligerents of the conflict viewed the United States not as a peacemaker, but as an ally of another belligerent force. No, Mr. Chairman, sending American troops to Bosnia is not good foreign policy, it's a recipe for disaster and we in Congress have an obligation to prevent it.

Sending our troops to Bosnia may achieve one particular result, it may well unite all the warring factions. And they will all be united against us as their common enemy.

It was just last month that I, and the majority of the House, supported H.R. 2606, a bill which prohibited the use of funds appropriated to the Department of Defense from being used for the ground deployment of United States armed forces in the Republic of Bosnia-Herzegovina as part of any peacekeeping operation, or as part of any implementation force, unless funds for such deployment are specifically appropriated by law. On October 30, 1995, I also supported, as did the majority of the House, House Resolution 247 expressing the sense of the House that no United States ground forces should be deployed to Bosnia without congressional approval. Tonight, I continue in my steadfast opposition to sending our troops to Bosnia and believe the best way of showing that opposition is by supporting H.R. 2770.

The war in Bosnia-Herzegovina is an 800-year-old struggle which is not ours. There is nothing going on in the Balkans that is worth losing one American live. I will never vote to send my neighbors' kids into that meat grinder. There is no discernable American interest, therefore there will be no American lives lost with my vote. There is no price in the Balkans which I am willing to pay with the blood of our military men and women.

By passing H.R. 2770, the House will be exercising its Article I power of the purse and ensuring that we have a say in whether the taxpayer will pay to have American troops thrown into the quagmire in Bosnia. And what we are saying is that we will not appropriate funds for this needless mission that has no vital American interest at stake.

The best way to support our troops is not to send them to Bosnia, and without the necessary funding they will be unable to go. That is the best way we can show our support for our troops. Should it wind up, however, that they have to go, we must ensure that we give them, and pay for, the best logistical support. We want them to be as well equipped as possible so that they will be able to finish the mission and return home as quickly as this President may permit.

Mr. Chairman, colleagues on both sides of the aisle, for the sake of America's sacred military honor and lives, we must pass H.R. 2770 and pass it tonight.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky). Pursuant to section 2 of House Resolution 304, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 210, nays 218, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 856]

YEAS—210

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bonilla
Bono
Bryant (TN)
Bryant (TX)
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Cooley
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doggett
Doolittle
Dornan
Duncan
Dunn
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Frisa
Funderburk
Gallegly
Ganske
Geren
Gilman
Goodling
Gordon
Graham
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Hostettler
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
Kingston
Kleczka
Klug
Knollenberg
LaHood
Largent
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Longley
Lucas
Manzullo
Martini
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Moorhead
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pombo
Porter
Pryce
Quillen
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rivers
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Schroeder
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Traficant
Upton
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wise
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff

NAYS—218

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barrett (WI)
Bateman
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Berman
Bevill
Bishop
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Brownback
Bunn
Burr
Callahan
Cardin
Castle
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Davis
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Doyle
Dreier
Durbin
Edwards
Ehlers
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goss
Green
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Holden
Houghton
Hoyer
Jackson-Lee
Jefferson
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston

Kanjorski	Mollohan	Serrano
Kennedy (MA)	Montgomery	Sisisky
Kennedy (RI)	Moran	Skaggs
Kennelly	Morella	Skelton
Kildee	Murtha	Slaughter
King	Nadler	Spratt
Klink	Neal	Stark
Kolbe	Nussle	Stenholm
LaFalce	Oberstar	Stokes
Lantos	Obey	Studds
Latham	Olver	Stupak
Leach	Ortiz	Tanner
Levin	Orton	Tejeda
Lewis (CA)	Owens	Thompson
Lewis (GA)	Pallone	Thornton
Lincoln	Pastor	Thurman
Livingston	Paxon	Torkildsen
Lowey	Payne (NJ)	Torres
Luther	Payne (VA)	Torricelli
Maloney	Pelosi	Towns
Manton	Peterson (FL)	Vento
Markey	Pickett	Visclosky
Martinez	Pomeroy	Volkmer
Mascara	Portman	Vucanovich
Matsui	Poshard	Ward
McCarthy	Quinn	Waters
McDermott	Rahall	Watt (NC)
McHale	Rangel	Waxman
McKinney	Reed	White
McNulty	Richardson	Wicker
Meehan	Roemer	Williams
Meek	Rose	Wilson
Menendez	Roybal-Allard	Wolf
Mfume	Rush	Woolsey
Miller (CA)	Sabo	Wyden
Minge	Sanders	Wynn
Mink	Sawyer	Yates
Moakley	Schumer	Zimmer
Molinari	Scott	

NOT VOTING—4

McInnis	Tucker
Riggs	Velazquez

□ 2029

Mr. BRYANT of Texas changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the bill was not passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 856, I was unable to be present because of a prior family commitment. Had I been present, I would have voted ''nay.''

□ 2030

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky). Pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 304, it is now in order to consider House Resolution 302.

RELATING TO DEPLOYMENT OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES IN BOSNIA TO ENFORCE PEACE AGREEMENT

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 304, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 302) relating to the deployment of United States Armed Forces in and around the territory of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina to enforce the peace agreement between the parties to the conflict in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of House Resolution 302 is as follows:

H. RES. 302

Resolved,

SECTION 1. FINDINGS.

The House of Representatives finds the following:

(1) On October 30, 1995, the House of Representatives agreed to H. Res. 247, which expressed the sense of the House of Representatives that in the negotiations of any peace agreement regarding the conflict in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina there should not be a presumption that United States Armed Forces would be deployed to that country to enforce such an agreement, and that in any event, no United States Armed Forces should be deployed on the ground in the territory of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina to enforce such an agreement until the Congress has approved such a deployment.

(2) On November 17, 1995, the House of Representatives passed H.R. 2606, which provided that none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available to the Department of Defense could be obligated or expended for the deployment on the ground of United States Armed Forces in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina unless funds for such deployment were specifically appropriated by law.

(3) Despite the expressed will of the House of Representatives heretofore mentioned, the President has chosen to proceed with the deployment of approximately 20,000 members of the United States Armed Forces on the ground in the territory of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina to enforce the peace agreement among the parties to the conflict in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina initialed in Dayton, Ohio, on November 21, 1995.

SEC. 2. DECLARATIONS OF POLICY.

The House of Representatives declares that—

(1) it reiterates serious concerns and opposition to the President's policy that results in the deployment of 20,000 members of the United States Armed Forces on the ground in the territory of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina;

(2) it is confident that the members of the United States Armed Forces, in whom it has the greatest pride and admiration, will perform their responsibilities with professional excellence, dedicated patriotism, and exemplary courage;

(3) the President and the Secretary of Defense should rely on the judgment of the commander of the United States Armed Forces that are deployed in and around the territory of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina in all matters affecting the safety, support, and well-being of such members of the Armed Forces;

(4) the President and the Secretary of Defense should ensure that the commander of the United States Armed Forces that are deployed in and around the territory of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina is furnished the resources and support that he needs to ensure the safety, support, and well-being of such members of the Armed Forces; and

(5) the United States Government in all respects should be impartial and evenhanded with all parties to the conflict in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina as necessary to assure the safety and protection of the United States Armed Forces in and around the territory of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 304, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BUYER] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and a Member opposed will be recognized for 30 minutes. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TORRICELLI] will be recognized in opposition.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BUYER].

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2½ minutes.

Mr. Speaker, there are many in this body, both Republicans and Democrats, who fundamentally agree that the President's policy in the Balkans is ill-conceived, poorly defined, and highly dangerous. The House has been heard on this issue.

It is ill-conceived, because the President 2 years ago promised 25,000 U.S. troops to enforce a future peace agreement without knowing what the situation would be on the ground. This commitment of 25,000 United States troops on the ground also is ill-conceived because the United States has lost the protection of neutrality after having bombed Bosnian Serbs and promising to arm and train Bosnia Moslems. The United States troops could become targets and casualties.

The implementation has been poorly defined in that the President has set a date certain as an exit strategy. If there are vital national security interests to place troops on the ground in the Balkans, then that is what is used to define your exit strategy. What is the success and what is the failure? You see, there are also other concerns, whether it is mission creep, whether it is the issue of the Nation-building exercises.

Let me also state this: The implementation plan we all understand will be highly dangerous, but it makes no sense to place U.S. troops on the ground that have lost the protection of neutrality.

Many of recognize the threat to the U.S. forces will not come from actual company or battalion size or platoon size attacks upon U.S. forces. It will come through cowardly acts of terror, whether it be by sniper, whether it be by bombings, whether it be by booby traps or accidents.

Let me share that this House has already been heard on this issue twice. First, we sent an overwhelming message, a bipartisan message, in that 315 Members of this body said ''Mr. President, do not negotiate a peace agreement based on the precondition that the U.S. troops will be there to implement whatever agreement you sign.'' He ignored that and he went forward. Then we had the Hefley amendment, and again the President ignored the Hefley amendment and proceeded anyway.

So now what we are doing here today is sending another message to the President: ''Mr. President, we reiterate our prior positions and also oppose United States ground troops in Bosnia.''

It is now our congressional oversight responsibility to narrow the parameters, and that is exactly what we do. We are saying as to matters on the field, listen to the commanders, give them the resources they need, make sure that we protect our force by making sure they are impartial and evenhanded to the conflict, and also we have the confidence in the U.S. Armed Forces to do their mission.

Mr. Torricelli. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ENGEL].

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from New Jersey for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, for the past 3 years, we have heard colleagues on both sides of the aisle, but particularly the Republican side of the aisle, say that the United States has not been forceful. We have been hearing for the past 3 years that the United States has not been forceful, that we have left the European allies to do the job in Bosnia, and they have been doing it ineffectively.

Now the President takes the bull by the horns and hammers out an agreement in Dayton and we are second-guessing and undermining and playing totally politics with the President.

Mr. Speaker, I was one of the Democrats that crossed party lines and supported President Bush during the Persian Gulf war. I did so because I believed that it was in the best interests of America not to undermine the President of the United States at such a crucial time in foreign policy. I believed that then, and I believe it now.

I would no more undermine President Clinton than I would undermine President Bush. We have been watching for nearly 4 years now, and we have seen visions of a new Holocaust rearing its ugly head in Europe again, 50 years after the end of the worst Holocaust in world history. We have seen ethnic cleansing, emaciated people, rapes, pillages. I think America does have a moral obligation to act. I do think that the stability of Europe is certainly in the vital interests of the U.S.

The NATO alliance is certainly important. If we were to do nothing now, the NATO alliance would be rendered impotent and go down the drain. So I do think we have a vital interests there. We are the leaders of the free world and we have to lead. We have seen in other parts of the world that things do not move until the U.S. acts, in the Middle East, South Africa, and Ireland. If we do not act, war will break out again, and it could such more countries into a greater war. We saw what appeasement did in the 1930's with Hitler, and when the United States and other nations did not step in, it led to a larger war.

When we talk about the Persian Gulf war, I remember my Republican colleagues at that time saying support the President, support the President. My God, during the Persian Gulf war we sent 50,000 troops to fight in a war, and the Republicans cheered. This is 20,000 troops to keep a peace. All the warring factions have invited us in. The mission is clearly defined, and the Pentagon, which is usually skeptical about peacekeeping, supports this and says it is doable and will be successful.

The same people who predicted doom and gloom in Haiti and were wrong are predicting gloom and doom again. So my colleagues, let us not undermine our troops, let us not undermine our President. We are the leaders of the free world, not an isolationist nation.

Mr. Speaker, we should defeat the Buyer resolution and support the Hamilton resolution, which supports our troops. The button I am wearing says blessed are the peacemakers, and blessed are the peacemakers. Blessed are our brave men and women, blessed are our troops, and blessed is our Nation in the undertaking we are about to do. Nothing could be more noble than what this country does, and nothing can be more noble than to end the carnage in Bosnia.

We are coming in as peacemakers. We are making peace. We are not fighting a war. We are giving that nation a chance to put itself together. In doing so we are strengthening NATO and we are strengthening ourselves. This is not the time to turn to isolationism. We accept the leadership of the free world. Nobody anointed us with it. We wanted it. We have it. We are to act like leaders, and here in Congress, no matter what the polls say, we are elected leaders, and we have to lead.

Mr. Speaker, I think what is going on now is in the best defining interests of our country. This is a great Nation, it has always stood for what is right, and as the President says, what we are doing is the right thing to do. Defeat this resolution. Support Mr. HAMILTON.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA].

(Mrs. ROUKEMA asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I rise as many of my colleagues before me have done, with grave reservations about the President's policy towards Bosnia and particularly has commitment to deploying at least 20,000 American service men and women to police the Bosnian peace agreement.

We all condemn the brutality perpetrated against innocent civilians in Bosnia, but President Clinton has yet to clearly explain to the American people what direct United States interest is at stake that warrants risking the lives of our servicemen and women. And, had none of our soldiers already arrived in Bosnia, I would stand here before you and argue that, without the full support of the American people behind sending United States troops to Bosnia, one lost life is one too many.

Let us not forget that, although the United States is attempting to be neutral as this peace goes forward, the United States was heavily involved in the NATO airstrikes that debilitated Serbian forces and led them to take a seat at the negotiating table. How can we be sure that American forces will not be targeted for retaliation by angry Serbians? Moreover, any attempt on our part to arm and train the Bosnian Moslems in preparation for our departure would directly contradict our spoken neutrality and put our troops at a much greater risk than that which they already face.

If our purpose in policing this peace agreement is to allow for the rebuilding of Bosnia, how can we put an arbitrary time limit of one year on United States occupation? This will accomplish little more than the unnecessary and unjustified loss of American lives, and could very well lead to a resumption of fighting once our troops are withdrawn. The ethnic and religious hatreds, in Bosnia have caused civil war and bloodshed for over 500 years. Ending this bloodshed would require an occupation force of unlimited duration, not merely 12 months. And, the argument that the war would spread to other parts of Europe without United States involvement does not carry much weight in my eyes, for how much has it spread over the past 4 years?

Congress has already voiced its overwhelming opposition to putting American ground troops in Bosnia by passing legislation that prohibits sending United States forces abroad unless Congress approves the appropriate funds for the operation.

However, the President has decided to send 20,000 servicemen and women to Bosnia over the objections of both Congress and the American people. We have a responsibility, a moral obligation, to support our Armed Forces in order to ensure that we in no way undermine their efforts but hopefully expedite their safe return home. We must offer unwavering support to the men and women of our United States forces, the greatest military in the world. Anything less on our part risks damaging the morale of our soldiers and, as we all know, strong unwielding morale is essential to unit coherence and success.

My colleagues, in closing, let me say that any of us can oppose the President's decision, as I most certainly do, but all of us must support the mission of our American forces.

☐ 2045

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri, the Honorable IKE SKELTON, coauthor of this amendment, who is well respected in this body.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, it has been said the more emotion, the less reason. Emotion reigns. The cry is, stop the bloodshed. Fine. But it should be done right, not in a way that defies common sense and puts our troops at a high and unacceptable risk.

On November 11 I set forth eight conditions under which American forces could go to Bosnia. Two of those conditions have not been met by the U.S. policy.

One, there is no clear and understandable exit plan or policy. This gives me great concern that we could find ourselves stuck like flies stuck to flypaper. Second, the United States has formally guaranteed to arm and train the Bosnian Moslems. The United States has formally agreed to coordinate the arming and the training of these Moslem forces. This policy defies common sense, because it will cause U.S. troops to be viewed as favoring one side over the other. It will destroy our impartiality and puts our troops in danger.

The Americans will be seen as the enemy by the Serbs; the Moslems will expect a wink and a favor, and when they do not get it, they will be angry. This policy causes our troops to become targets of anger and vengeance. This policy of arming and training Bosnian Moslems, even though through a third party but guaranteed and supervised by us, concerns me.

There are three points to be considered. First, already there exits a parity between the warring factions, the Serbs on the one hand and the Croat-Moslem federation on the other. Note the recent battlefield successes by the federation.

Secondly, our allies and our military leaders in this country are not in favor of arming and training the Moslem forces. The French and British in particular are against it.

In order to have peacekeeping work, there must be trust. Trust of the former belligerents, of the impartiality of the peacekeepers. This trust and confidence will not exist so long as our government pursues the policy of supervising the arming and training of the Moslems. The U.S. field manual regarding peacekeeping states peacekeeping requires an impartial evenhanded approach. I have raised this issue with the President.

Mr. Speaker, we are sending our troops into Bosnia and putting them into an atmosphere of hostility. Serbian President Milosevic told the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. RAMSTAD] and the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. DANNER] the following: ''Provisions to equip and train Bosnian Muslims are not part of the Dayton agreements. Such an effort would not be evenhanded and would be a mistake for the U.S.'' He went on to say, ''I would ask the U.S. to reconsider the equip and train effort, as it will have no positive effect and be a waste of money. It will establish the wrong psychology in the area, preparing for war instead of preparing for peace.''

Mr. Speaker, the only resolution before us to address this issue of the United States arming and training the Moslems is the Buyer-Skelton measure. It calls for the United States, in all respects, to be impartial. This present U.S. policy is placing our soldiers into the snake pit of the Balkans and angering half of the snakes. Our troops deserve to be put in an atmosphere that they expect, that of impartiality, as evenhanded peacekeepers; an atmosphere where all the warring sides will see the soldiers wearing American flags as truly impartial, where the warring sides will not see Americans as enemies and put targets on their backs.

Mr. Speaker, this policy is putting the American corporal, who is trying to settle a problem between a Serb soldier and a Moslem soldier, in an impossible and dangerous position. I urge a strong vote for the Buyer-Skelton measure.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS].

Mr SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, tonight this House faces a choice. We can choose to support the President of the United States in his decision to help end the tragic war in Bosnia, in his decision to act with our NATO allies to stop the killing in Europe for the third time in this century, in his decision to nurture a peace that, without question, will be fraught with its own risks and dangers. Or, we can choose to desert the President at this time of challenge to American leadership, to seek moral comfort for this country in the failure of Europeans to end the slaughter, to watch the war resume, content that the vital interests of the United States might, this time, escape the blight of war in Europe. As between a problematic peace and a horrific war, I choose to support the President's courageous work for peace.

Mr Speaker, 10 days ago, in Sarajevo, with the gentleman from Indiana and 13 others, we encountered a moving scene outside the presidential palace in Sarajevo. The long-suffering people there, tears flowing from the eyes of an older woman who had lost her son in the war, pleaded with us that only America could solve this disaster. It was a poignant reminder that this is not a problem that can be solved by Europeans without American leadership.

At lunch the next day, with Army troopers in Germany, another poignant reminder, as I listened to one young Army Specialist who told me he had taken his Thanksgiving leave to visit Dachau. And he said, ''Congressman, if this country has the power to prevent that from happening again, we must do what we can.'' Another reminder of an earlier problem that could not be solved by the Europeans without American leadership.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is important to remember that this is not just about Bosnia. Other actors around the world are watching these events and will be taking their cue. If leaders of dispossessed ethnic groups elsewhere in Europe and in the new states of the Soviet Union see the international community unable to act effectively here, they may well challenge the compromises that have been worked out in their states and, eventually, we may lose much of what we had won in the Cold War.

This President has shown courage for taking on this difficult responsibility in the face of political risks and public opposition. A vote for this resolution to oppose this mission will only serve to encourage both the enemies of peace in Bosnia and the enemies of United States leadership in the pursuit of a decent international order.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California. [Mr. GALLEGLY].

(Mr. GALLEGLY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, I stand in strong support of the Buyer-Skelton resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Buyer/Skelton resolution regarding the deployment of U.S. ground forces to Bosnia. I am concerned, however, that this resolution could provide a blank check for the further deployment of U.S. forces beyond the 20,000 we have been told are being sent.

It should come as no surprise to you that I share the strong skepticism and opposition of many of my Colleagues with respect to the commitment of United States ground forces to Bosnia. I voted for the Dornan resolution because I felt that the most emphatic way to express my opposition to the President's decision was to deny any funding for sending our troops to Bosnia before they actually began arriving in that country.

I believe the Buyer-Skelton resolution is acceptable because it does express our opposition to the President's decision while at the same time saying that the House will support the troops once they are deployed.

Even the Hamilton resolution can be acceptable because it goes directly to the issue of supporting our troops whether we agreed with the President or his decision or not.

I do not share our Commander in Chief's position. However, I do appreciate the dilemma he faces as a full partner in the NATO alliance and the responsibilities which come with that partnership.

While I agree with the President's claim that we have an interest in the future of Bosnia, I see absolutely no vital national security interest, domestic or military, being served by sending American troops into this hostile and volatile place.

Make no mistake, our troops, which will be heavily armed and expertly trained, are not going into Bosnia to keep the peace. They are going in to enforce the peace. And the act of enforcement often comes at a price. This deployment is especially dangerous because many Serbs will see our troops as being there, not as impartial arbiters, but as protectors of the Muslims.

Mr. Speaker we are at the point where the deployment of U.S. ground forces is a fait accompli. Nevertheless, it is our duty to the citizens of this nation to express our views on this matter and my view is that we should not be sending our troops to Bosnia.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

(Mr. DORNAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DORAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of my friends, the gentleman from Missouri, IKE SKELTON, and the gentleman from Indiana, Major BUYER. And for me, obviously, I support the troops and I will be there with them at Christmas. Join me.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. MOLINARI] who accompanied me on a trip to the Balkans.

Ms. MOLINARI. Mr. Speaker, I support this resolution very clearly, because it does clearly state our opposition to the policy that has brought us here today.

This is a policy which began with an unfair, uneven arms embargo that left a people crippled, at war. It continued with a policy that reneged on the threats of air strikes to stop an aggressor waging war against civilians, and it has become a policy that allows the most vicious of war criminals to remain in the region with our troops in harm's way.

Nevertheless, despite Congress' prior stands against this policy, our troops will be in the region within a week. So tonight we are not only reiterating our opposition to that flawed policy that brought us here; we are also saying to our troops, Godspeed with your mission. It is a terrible policy, but it is a noble mission that may bring peace to a region that has not known peace and hope to a people afraid now to hope.

But, Mr. President, we are also saying in this resolution that we will be watching to make certain that everything possible is being done to ensure the safety of our troops and to see that the civilian side of rebuilding stays on course. So, you see, since there is nothing Congress can do to change the President's course, I think we have an obligation to make sure that our troops are not caught in the middle of two wars, one in Bosnia and one in Washington; and I believe that the Buyer resolution, as opposed to the other resolutions, fulfills that.

Last and most importantly, this resolution clearly states to our troops that regardless of our position on policy or on mission, that we are with them; that we are proud of them; that we are cheering for them; and that we are praying for them.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. POSHARD].

Mr. POSHARD. Mr. Speaker, I had three serious questions I needed answered when I went to the Balkans 2 weeks ago. Do the people, including the leadership of Bosnia, Serbia, and Croatia, really want peace? Has our military mission been planned to minimize every possible risk to our men and women who are going there? And is this mission, this policy, the right thing for America?

I felt strongly the first two questions were answered affirmatively, but it is the third question, the question of policy, which I want to address. And it was on the streets of Sarajevo that the rightness of this policy became clear to me.

A crowd gathered around us in the street in front of the President's office; an elderly lady in tears, pouring out her heart, was telling us of her whole family being killed, of the babies in the building where she lived being killed by mortars.

In the anguish of an elderly man, standing not far from her, came these words. He said, ''Do you not understand that only America can ensure the peace? Only if America comes will we have peace. We trust America.''

Mr. Speaker, I was an 18-year-old kid in Korea, 32 years ago, 12 years after the war, with the First Cav Division keeping the peace in Korea. I remember walking around the streets of Munsani and Yongigo, and the Korean people coming up to us and saying, ''Thank you for being here. If not for America, we would have no peace.'' I remember understanding very clearly then what America meant to people who want peace and freedom.

For the past 32 years, I have intellectualized the role of America in the world. I voted on authorizations and appropriations for foreign policy and military policy, but not until the streets of Sarajevo was I reminded again of what America means to people who are without hope.

Why did they say that only America can ensure the peace? Why did they say, standing there in the midst of ruins, knowing that 250,000 of their people were killed, that 2 million were homeless, why did they say they trust America?

What do they trust? Our superior military forces? Yes. Our leadership of the free world? Yes. Our democratic institutions? Yes. But more than that, they trust the experience of America. They trust the history of America, which no other country can match.

Look around this Chamber. We have come to this country from every nation in the world, from every background, every ethnic, every religious, every racial background.

□ 2100

And we have shown the world that we can live together in brotherhood, tolerating our differences and finding common ground, rather than battlegrounds, upon which to build.

We have chosen to live together, to overcome our differences, and they know that. If we, among all nations, cannot send one division among all the divisions we have in Europe to Bosnia to enforce a peace, to give people a chance to live again with one another, then what Nation will stand in our stead? What nation will give others the hope that only America can give?

If we think people, given the chance in Sarajevo, cannot live together in peace and overcome the forces of hate which inflame passions of ethnic and religious pride, then I tell my colleagues, look at Belfast, look at the Middle East. We cannot go to Sarajevo and fail to understand the faith that people have in the experiment and the experience that is America.

Mr. Speaker, the tears of that grandmother on the streets of Sarajevo are the tears of every grandmother for all time who has lost her son or daughter to wars of injustice. But they are only, in part, tears of regret. They are also tears of hope that at some time in the future someone else's grandson or granddaughter will be walking down the streets of Sarajevo glad that years ago America came and peace came with her. Oppose this resolution.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds to respond to the last speaker. I would say that foreign policy must be guided by our heads, not our hearts.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EVANS] in the spirit of bipartisanship that brings the Buyer-Skelton amendment.

(Mr. EVANS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I oppose sending ground troops to Bosnia and support this resolution and hope that my colleagues will also.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose the decision to send ground forces to Bosnia because it will put our soldiers in the middle of an ethnic powderkeg that could explode again at any moment.

Neither the Dayton Agreement nor military force can erase the centuries of ethnic unrest and dissension that has fueled this conflict. This hatred will not cease. Even as the warring parties prepare for the implementation of the agreement, different factions have burned and looted property that will be turned back to their opponents. Can we expect the peace to last considering this level of animosity or the history of the region?

This leads me to believe that this agreement will unravel. If it does, our soldiers will be in the middle of the conflict. But even if it does last, this operation is a risky proposition. Our soldiers will face the dangers posed by some 6 million landmines, many of them scattered indiscriminately throughout the unforgiving terrain of the region. And numerous armed terrorist groups, who may not be easily controlled by the signers of the agreement, may attack our forces for their own political gains.

Considering the history of the region and the many threats our soldiers face, I cannot support this mission. I urge my colleagues to vote for the resolution.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute and 20 seconds to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHRYSLER].

Mr. CHRYSLER. Mr. Speaker, I was told today that the reason the President is sending troops to Bosnia is to ''break the cycle of violence.'' This, alone, is not an acceptable reason to risk the lives of young Americans.

Four conditions must be met before we commit United States ground troops anywhere: First, there must be a vital national interest at stake. Mr. Speaker, there is no vital national interest at stake in Bosnia. Second, there must be a clear mission and a reasonable change of success Mr. Speaker, there is no clear mission and no reasonable chance of success. Third, there must be a clear exit strategy. Mr. Speaker, a time line to withdraw before the next election is not an exit strategy.

Fourth, and most importantly, we must have the support of the American people, whose husbands, wives, sons, and daughters are asked to sacrifice their lives to achieve the mission.

Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the debate this evening and I have heard not one member of Congress even pretend that the American people support this deployment.

During this season of peace on earth and good will towards men, I can understand the desire to bring peace to a

war torn nation. However, Mr. Speaker, I have two sons in their twenties and a daughter who just turned 18. I would not send them to die in the snows of Bosnia in support of this policy, and therefore I cannot, in good conscience, support asking other parents to do so.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN].

(Ms. HARMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, like the majority of my colleagues, I wish that our Bosnia policy had been focused and clear 4 years ago, before a quarter of a million people died and 3 million more became refugees.

Mr. Speaker, two presidents hesitated and the results were an arms embargo that ratified arms imbalance, a hobbled U.N., and a belated bombing campaign. Another Holocaust was occurring, but the world held back.

Time and again the Congress warned the President, and I did too. ''Lift the arms embargo,'' we said. ''Do not make a commitment of troops a precondition to peace,'' we said, but he chose otherwise. Now, the options are fewer, but I am clear on what course is morally correct. We must support peace.

The Dayton accord, though far from perfect, is the last option for peace in an exhausted region. I too was there last weekend and Sarajevo broke my heart. I gave my word to General Bill Crouch, Commander of the U.S. Army in Europe, to Admiral Layton ''Snuffy'' Smith, Commander of the NATO operation, and to Corporal Patricia Villa, Sergeant Marie LaRue, and Private First Class Don Bradley, all of California, that I would vote to support them.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot vote for a resolution that sends a confused message. I cannot vote for a resolution that prevents a separate effort to achieve military parity so the future aggression will be deterred.

I would prefer a more just peace, but it is not available. This is the peace we can achieve, and it is unpardonable to let it pass by.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FOLEY].

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am directing this to those Americans who are watching. I want to clear up what this debate is about. Is it about America's leadership? Absolutely not. Our leadership brought the warring factions of this evil war to Dayton in an attempt to resolve their differences, but diplomacy does not include sending American troops.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman must address his remarks to the Chair, and not to people watching on television. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, diplomacy does not include sending American troops—our finest men and women—into danger. Deployment of troops relates to national security and I don't believe a national security risk exists in the Balkans.

To be the leader of the free world does not require our troops to face a brutal winter in a war zone that is littered with as many as 6 million land mines.

Is it about supporting our troops—NO. I will not, nor should one Member of this Congress, allow our troops to be left to hang out to dry. I will fight to ensure that we have no more tragedies like Somalia.

This deployment is a 2-year-old promise that the administration made, and I believe it has made our troops a bargaining chip in the negotiations.

I oppose sending Americans to Bosnia and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, if NATO had acted and punished Serbian aggression when it first occurred 4 years ago, we would not be here tonight; the West would not have repeated the mistakes of Munich; and, more than 200,000 people would not have died.

After almost 4 years of NATO drift, Croatian military success and NATO bombing of Serbian forces have enabled the Clinton administration to stop the killing and negotiate a peace. I steadfastly opposed the use of American ground forces there during the wartime situation, but our troops and our allies' troops are now going to police a peace.

Mr. Speaker, if they go under the Buyer approach, we will be sending a signal of uncertainty that will in my view increase the risk of attack on our troops by those who read congressional opposition as a signal that if they just kill a few Americans, we will pull the plug, just as we did in Somalia.

If my colleagues vote for Buyer, it seems to me they logically should have voted for Dornan in order to prevent the financing of the operation in the first place.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge my colleagues to lay down that uncertain trumpet and pass the Hamilton amendment clean without Buyer. Send a clear message that we will leave no doubt about the strength of our resolve.

Mr. Speaker, but by the grace of God, our souls at birth could have been infused into a body born in Bosnia rather than one born on American soil. Only an accident of birth makes us lucky enough to live out our lives as Americans.

Now our troops are going to make peace, not war in an act of mercy toward many of our fellow human beings on this globe. Do our duty tonight. It may not be popular, but it will be right and it will make our troops safer.

Support Hamilton clean, defeat Buyer. That is the best way to help our troops.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. BROWNBACK].

(Mr. BROWNBACK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Buyer bill, supporting the troops, opposing the President's policy.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BLUTE].

Mr. BLUTE. Mr. Speaker, we all have concerns and trepidations about the President's ill-defined policy in that war-torn part of the world. But we have had two votes in this House that sent an unequivocal message on where we stand on that issue.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me tonight we are way beyond that now, and for those of us who believe that the President has the constitutional authority to deploy these troops, and who oppose the War Powers Act as unconstitutional and abrogating the President's power, we must support the Buyer-Skelton resolution.

We must recognize that as we speak tonight, the planes are landing, the troops are on the ground, and many thousands more are en route. Young Americans in harm's way. Regardless of our criticism of this policy, it is time tonight to rally behind our troops and send them and any potential adversary, the message that we stand behind them 100 percent and the Congress of the United States is behind them in their mission.

Vote for Buyer-Skelton and vote for our young men and women in Bosnia.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. OLVER].

(Mr. OLVER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, for 4 years, Americans have seen in CNN detail the concentration camps and the ethnic cleansing and the systematic slaughter of civilians. Who dares forget the mass slaughter of the males in Srebrenica, thousands of men and boys, when that U.S.-designated safe haven, swelled with refugees, was overrun by the Bosnia Serbs, all because the United Nations proved that it could not and would not stop the genocide.

Events have shown that the United States is the only power in the world that can stop such crimes. To secure peace, President Clinton has courageously put himself and America's conscience on the line. America led NATO to stop the war, America led the negotiations for peace, and now America must lead NATO in securing the peace so that wounds can heal and justice can evolve.

The United States wields such power morally as well as militarily because of how the world perceives us. As has been eloquently written, America is seen as a ''good and tolerant country; a country that leaves people alone, but does not leave evil alone; a country

that will find the courage to act where the courage to act is wanting. We are not the world's policeman, but we are not the world's innocent bystander. To do nothing about Bosnia would steal the meaning from the American victory in the cold war.''

In the year that NATO will be in Bosnia, boundaries will be secured, warring factions separated, and 2 million refugees who want to return to their homes will be secured in their return.

Those are NATO's purposes. But the purpose of America's presence and participation with NATO is stability in Europe and peace in Bosnia to give Bosnia the opportunity to become again the multireligious, multicultural society that this tragic manufactured war was designed to destroy.

Mr. Speaker, there was a wonderful photo in the New York Times this past Sunday. Mr. Speaker, 3,000 Sarajevans, Bosnians of Catholic and Moslem and Orthodox faith, demonstrating in unity to show that after all the suffering and horror of 4 years, the idea of a multiethnic, multireligious Bosnia has survived.

The ultimate test for peace is whether Bosnians will use wisely the opportunity provided by the 1-year NATO mission to grow those 3,000 to 30,000 to 300,000 and beyond in rebuilding Bosnia. This is our time to act.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to defeat the Buyer resolution and to pass the Hamilton resolution.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time I have left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BUYER] has 18 minutes and 10 seconds, and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TORRICELLI] has 12½ minutes.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. FOWLER].

(Mrs. FOWLER asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Buyer-Skelton resolution.

I have long opposed the deployment of United States troops to Bosnia. I have twice voted against such a deployment, and have written the President, urging him not to send troops.

I believe that our Nation's interests in Bosnia are important. I have supported the involvement of our sea and air forces, our intelligence and logistics assets, and our most diligent diplomatic efforts. But I have never felt our interests were so vital that they warranted putting our ground troops at risk.

Accordingly, I voted for the Dornan measure to oppose the provision of funds to carry out this mission.

However, while I supported the Dornan legislation, I recognize that the President will disregard it. Thus, I will also vote for the Buyer-Skelton resolution. If our troops are going to go—and there is no doubt that they will—the first are already there they should be certain of our commitment to ensure they have every resource necessary to accomplish their mission.

I urge the House to support this measure.

□ 2115

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE], chairman of the Committee on National Security.

(Mr. SPENCE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I have heard Members say on the floor this evening that we should support peace. When I think back, we have supported peace all over this world in recent times. We supported peace in Lebanon, in Somalia. We had people killed in both places because of it. We withdrew.

It is easy for Members to get up here and say that they have concern for people who are being killed in other places throughout the world. Somehow or another they divorce that from the killing of our own people in the process. Mr. Speaker, I do not represent those people in Bosnia. I represent people back here. The lives of our people are more important than the others. It just comes down to that.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BARRETT].

(Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Buyer-Skeleton resolution.

Bosnia, a name, that up until a few years ago, was rarely mentioned on the House floor, and most of us probably couldn't have found it on a map. Yet, today, U.S. troops are going there to help make sure it continues to exist because it has suddenly become in our national security interest to do so.

None of use who've searched our hearts can say that there haven't been crimes against humanity in Bosnia. None of us want to see those crimes ever happen again.

The President has decided that committing the United States and our NATO allies will put a stop to the slaughter of innocent Bosnians. Perhaps, but for how long?

However, when committing a democratic government, such as ours, to a policy, Congress too has to show a commitment. In the last Congress, we urged the President to lift the arms embargo. In this Congress, we've told the President on several occasions not to send ground troops unless he gets our approval first. Yet, the President took no action on the embargo and ignored us regarding the troops.

We're being asked now to support this policy because the troops are on their way to Bosnia.

This begs the question: Can we support the troops knowing that the policy they, and we, are being asked to uphold is wrong? Can a civil war that has been raging for centuries be cured by a 1-year stay of foreign forces?

The White House has claimed the President is showing leadership, that as the leader of NATO we, as a nation, must also show leadership, that as the only remaining world's superpower, we must show leadership.

But, is being lead into a swamp with no clear path out leadership? Will NATO remain intact when this policy fails? Will the world question our leadership even more when we pull out and Bosnia resumes its bloody civil and ethnic war?

Our troops could end up paying the price of our leadership with their lives. Our troops must understand that we will support them, as we've always done, but that we have no confidence in the President's policy that put them there. This message must be made crystal clear to the President and our troops.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Montgomery], a very respected Member of this institution.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bipartisan Buyer-Skelton resolution that expresses opposition to the President's policy to deploy 20,000 members of the United States Armed Forces to Bosnia.

Mr. Speaker, I do not support putting American forces on the ground but since the deployment has begun, I agree with the Buyer provisions that say that the President and Secretary of Defense shall rely on the judgment of the United States commander in Bosnia.

This resolution, Mr. Speaker, makes it very clear that despite our opposition to the President's mission, we stand behind the brave men and women who serve in Bosnia and, also, God bless these great Americans.

I point out to this group tonight, they are all volunteers and they are serving under the American flag.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan, [Mr. Levin].

(Mr. LEVIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, if I might, let me share what I learned in Bosnia. First, Dayton is a declaration of peace, not war. Second, there are serious self-interests on the part of all the three parties. The Dayton agreement was reached but not primarily made in America. For each of those parties, there is a clear self-interest.

Third, the U.S. military is supported. As one general said to us, we can do the job. It is a task defined, limited and achievable, and they have authority to take whatever force is necessary to protect our troops.

If Members vote to reject Dayton, what they are saying is not only no to the Commander in Chief but no to the military leadership of our nation. They helped draft this plan.

There is some risk in peace. There is also risk in renewed war, the risk of a renewed war in Europe spilling over beyond Bosnia and the renewed risk of genocide.

I would like to say to my friend from Indiana, yes, we have to make policy with our heads, hard-headed ways.

Americans also have a heart, and the prospect of renewed genocide is something that should not be ignored.

Finally, I want to say there is an exit strategy. It is very clear. If the parties who have chosen peace continue on that path, we will help them. If they choose to renew war, we are going to get out and get out fast.

I urge support of Hamilton and that we vote against Buyer.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. LONGLEY] a comrade of mine from the Gulf war.

(Mr. LONGLEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LONGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the President's policies and in support of the troops.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GILCHREST].

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Buyer-Skelton resolution. This is not a Tonkin Gulf resolution. The situation we are debating here is not about Beirut. It is not about Somalia. It is not about Haiti.

There are risks in this policy of our intervention. There are profound unknowns. Does the military, and this is the question we need to ask, have the force necessary to meet those risks, to meet those unknowns? We want to make sure that they do. Is there a chance in this situation for a profound change in a positive way in this world as a result of our efforts? The answer should be yes, can be yes, must be yes.

The policy up to this point, in my judgment, has been haphazard and indecisive. The Buyer-Skelton resolution allows us from this point on to be decisive, clear. And as we go through this dark tunnel together, let us all hold this torch high to light the way and chase away the demons.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. KENNELLY].

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, tonight we are at a very important point in the history of the United States of America, the point that many would not have chosen to come upon. But now is that moment and we must involve ourselves. Why?

Mr. Speaker, yesterday in this Chamber, Shimon Peres, Israel's prime minister, appealed for American leadership in the world. Today, as we debate the appropriate use of American power in bringing an end to 4 years of bloodshed and suffering in Bosnia, we would do well to remember the prime minister's words. ''You cannot escape that which America alone can do,'' he said. ''America alone can keep the world free . . .''

We are, as is frequently observed, the world's only superpower. We possess a potent combination of military and moral authority. But possession is not enough: we must also exercise our authority when the occasion demands it. This administration has done that.

American leadership brought the warring parties to the peace table, and American leadership must ensure that this peace process survives. Failure to lead would guarantee the continuation—even the expansion of bloodshed. It would endanger the future of NATO, an organization that has brought nearly four decades of peace to Europe.

But perhaps worst, failure to lead would undercut our reputation for steadfastness in the pursuit of peace throughout the world. It would signal that we shrink from our responsibilities, instead of shouldering the burdens that accompany leadership.

We must demand more of ourselves. As President Clinton said, ''We cannot stop all war for all time; but we can stop some wars. We cannot save all women and all children; but we can save many of them. We can't do everything; but we must do what we can.''

In the three wars that shaped this century—World War I, World War II, and the cold war—America achieved victory because we were willing to exercise leadership. Now we have another opportunity to lead—this time to shape the peace that will govern the next century. I urge my colleagues to shoulder this responsibility and seize this opportunity. I will oppose the Buyer resolution which does not support this opportunity to preserve a lasting peace. I urge my colleagues to support the Hamilton resolution and ensure that peace will remain in Bosnia.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky). The Chair would advise that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BUYER] has 14 minutes and 10 seconds remaining, and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TORRICELLI] has 8½ minutes remaining.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX].

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Buyer-Skelton resolution which recognizes the fact that the American public still has reservations about the President's policy in Bosnia but wholeheartedly supports our troops who are there. There are serious reservations about what the precise mission of our forces is, what are the specific rules of engagement, what will happen when NATO forces leave and what is our national interest there. While questions remain regarding these questions I have raised, we support our troops, our sons and daughters that have been sent to Bosnia. We completely back them to make sure that they have equipment, the resources and tools that they need. We need to make sure we protect them so that the mission will be speedily and successfully handled.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I hope and pray that we will soon see a permanent end to the hostilities and atrocities, relief for the war's victims, justice at the war crimes tribunal, and the safe and speedy return of our brave soldiers. Support Buyer-Skelton.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM], former naval commander.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight in very strong support of the Buyer resolution. I think it is very clear, despite the opposition of many of us, that the President is going to put the troops in Bosnia and that the votes today are not here to avoid that happening.

I want to join with my colleagues in supporting our men and women in uniform over there. I believe while they are there we owe them that obligation. But that in no measure means that I, nor many of you, believe they should be there. It is a very dangerous and I think highly inappropriate use of military force. It is dangerous because our troops on the ground in Bosnia are going to be the subject and targets of radical Moslem terrorists who have another agenda, and it is inappropriate because there is no vital United States military interest there.

We cannot afford to be the policemen of the world. And there is no realistic expectation that when our troops leave, there will not be a resumption of the civil war over there. I believe in supporting our men and women, but I simply cannot condone nor support the operation that is going on over there. I think the Buyer resolution strikes the right balance under the circumstances tonight. I strongly support it.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], prospective and former Army sergeant.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, observation. Our troops are going and there is nothing we are going to be able to do about it. One of the things that concerns me is that we do not profit from history.

We went into Beirut and we lost 241 Marines blown all to heck, trying to solve their problems that are of an age-old nature. We went into Somalia and got involved in a civil conflict there and guys driving around on pickup trucks with machine guns in the back drove us out of there. Aideed, the tyrant, the tribal leader, is still in power over there and we spent hundreds of millions of dollars. And we pulled out and we did not solve that problem.

And now we are going into a quagmire much greater than either one of those, believing that we are going to solve those problems. We are not going to solve those problems. A year from now we will probably pull out and the war will go on and people will continue to die and we will have lost a lot of young men and women unnecessarily.

So tonight all I want to say, because this is a fait accompli, is God bless those soldiers and God bless their parents and loved ones.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LAHOOD].

(Mr. LAHOOD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LaHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on the president's plan to deploy United States troops to Bosnia.

While I am opposed to sending troops to enforce a fragile peace in a region plagued by war and mired in ethnic conflict, I do want to be clear that I am fully supportive of the troops that will be on the ground.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the troops on the ground need and deserve our full support, so that as they head into harm's way they will have the assurance that the thoughts of those at home are with them.

Offering support for the troops, however, does not mean that Congress has no role in the troop deployment or is relinquishing its role in the area of foreign policy.

Mr. SPEAKER. I would also like to mention that my constituent, Sgt. Mathew Chipman, of Beardstown, IL, was one of the first army personnel to set foot on Bosnian soil.

His picture was in the front page of every newspaper in the country.

Sgt. Chipman is a long time veteran of the army with many years of service. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud of Sgt. Chipman and his family. He will be in our thoughts and prayers.

Indeed, Congress does have a role in foreign policy. At the very least. It is incumbent on the President to come before both Houses of Congress and present his plan on deploying troops to the former Yugoslavia, as well as his plan defining the mission and exit strategy for those troops.

Historically, before committing large numbers of U.S. troops to crisis areas overseas, it has been customary for the President to seek the consent of Congress before initiating a deployment of military forces.

In this case, the President has not sought approval of Congress for his actions, yet, the President intends to fly to Paris today for the purpose of signing a treaty that will obligate over 20,000 troops for operations in Bosnia.

If the President, with or without Congressional approval, intends to place American troops in harm's way—and it appears that this is what he intends to do—then I urge the President, in consultation with Congress, to articulate a clear mission statement and to define an achievable exit strategy.

Our troops on the ground need to know precisely what it is that they are being asked to do—and Congress deserves a role in making that determination.

Mr BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia, [Mr. CHAMBLISS], a member of the Committee on National Security.

(Mr. CHAMBLISS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Speaker, this has been a very difficult decision that we have had to deal with, the deployment of troops to Bosnia. I, along with the gentleman from Missouri, [Mr. SKELTON], and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BUYER], have sat in the Committee on National Security over the last several weeks and we have asked very serious questions of the administration.

Those are the same questions that have been alluded to by Mr. SKELTON earlier. Those questions simply have not been answered. I voted in favor of the Dornan amendment earlier. That vote by me in favor of the Dornan amendment was a statement. It was a statement that, Mr. President, you have not provided the information satisfactory to this Congress to authorize this Congress to vote in favor of deploying troops to Bosnia.

□ 2130

In spite of that, that decision has been made. That decision is behind us now, as the gentleman from Indiana, [Mr. BURTON], just said. It is time now to move on. When we move on, we must leave this House, leaving nothing unturned, but giving our unconditional support to the troops, the brave men and women in Bosnia. The Buyer-Skelton resolution does that. I urge support of that resolution.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago when the reality of the holocaust came to light, people of conscience said never again to ethnic cleansing and to genocide. These abhorrent actions have continued despite this promise. I believe that the world can no longer turn a blind eye to Bosnia and the tragedies that are there. That is why I commend President Clinton for his leadership, support the troops for their courage, and will support the Hamilton amendment.

I rise in opposition to the resolution on the floor at this time, because I believe our country can be proud of the leadership in bringing the warring parties to the conflict in Bosnia to the negotiating table and for the successful conclusion of the Bosnian peace talks. Now we should join with other nations in ensuring that the peace agreement can be implemented.

Mr. Speaker, the United States does have a national interest in peace in the former Yugoslavia. As the world's lone superpower, we have the obligation to lead. Several hundred thousand innocent children, men and women have died in the conflict in Bosnia. The war must stop.

At stake if the United States does not participate in the Bosnian peace process are the role of the United States as a world leader, the future viability of NATO, and the risk of reigniting the conflagration in Bosnia. A continuing Bosnian conflict threatens to spread killing and destruction to other European states. The terrible acts of ethnic cleansing and brutal atrocities challenge the conscience of us all.

Is the Bosnian mission without danger and risk? No. With strong leadership, there are always risks. These risks have been minimized, and they are risks for peace, risks for ending years of bloodshed, risks for freedom. We risk far more by failing to act. We risk far more if we allow the tenuous peace to collapse and watch the flames of war ignite again.

For this reason I oppose this resolution, urge support of the Hamilton resolution, and commend President Clinton for this leadership.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] for the perspective of a former Army infantry first lieutenant.

(Mr. BEREUTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I think we need to have a summary of what the Buyer-Skelton resolution really does for I think it is being lost in some of the rhetoric here. It has two parts.

First is a reiteration of votes that the House has already taken on October 30 and November 17. The second is a policy statement which I think all Members should be able to support. First of all, it is an expression of confidence, pride and admiration in members of the U.S. armed services.

Second, it reinforces the need to respect the judgment of the military leadership in the field. After Somalia, that kind of debacle suggests this kind of policy advice from the Congress is essential.

Third, it reinforces the policy that proper weaponry and logistical support must be provided to our troops in the field. Again, after the Somalia debacle, that kind of advice from the Congress is entirely essential and appropriate.

Mr. Speaker, there is no vital interest for the United States in Bosnia. I very much approve of the Buyer-Skelton resolution, and ask all of my colleagues to support it.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. NADLER].

(Mr. NADLER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Hamilton resolution as one who has spoken out for the last 4 years urging that we do the one thing that would enable the people of Bosnia to defend themselves against organized aggression, violence, rape, torture and genocide; lift the arms embargo. This was not done. Tragically, the war and the mass murders continued.

By maintaining the arms embargo, which prevented the Bosnians from defending themselves against aggression and genocide, we incurred a heavy moral burden. We now have one final chance to meet that burden, to end the killing, to stop the genocide, and to restore peace. Let us meet the obligation we incurred, least it be said the United States did nothing to stop the genocide. Let us give peace a chance, let us support the President, let us support the Hamilton resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky). The gentleman

from Indiana [Mr. BUYER] has 8½ minutes remaining and the right to close, and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TORRICELLI] has 5½ minutes remaining.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LAUGHLIN] a present colonel in the U.S. Army Reserve.

(Mr. LAUGHLIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. LAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I supported the Dornan amendment because I believe the President of the United States, our Commander-in-Chief, has not given us the vital national interest reasons to put our troops in Bosnia.

On the very day President Kennedy stopped the Russian troops off the coast of Cuba, many of my classmates and I signed our contracts to be members of the U.S. Army. History proved President Kennedy right.

Later my three brothers and I volunteered during the Vietnam era. All three of my brothers went to Vietnam. I was sent elsewhere. History proved us wrong when we believed vital national interests were involved there.

Later I supported the Persian Gulf war. History proved us right on vital national interests there.

Today we are asking young men and women of America to become targets of opportunity for a civil war in Bosnia, and history will provide those of us who oppose this policy right. The President of the United States, our Commander-in-Chief, has not demonstrated any vital national interest for the brave young men and women who have risked their lives in defense of freedom to go to Bosnia. I ask support of the Buyer-Skelton resolution.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCHALE] a comrade of mine from the Persian Gulf war, for the perspective of a lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps.

Mr. MCHALE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Buyer-Skelton resolution. As I have listened to the oppositions voiced by many of my good friends and colleagues, I have to wonder whether they have read the resolution. In fact, there are two elements, Mr. Speaker, contained in this resolution.

The first element is one of opposition to the policy. The simple fact of the matter is the vast majority of the Members of the House opposed the decision to deploy. But the second element is far more important. Let me speak with passion on that issue. A few days ago I watched an interview on CNN of a lieutenant colonel named Bronco Lane, and he said whatever people think of the mission, he urged support for his men, for his soldiers.

We are a good and powerful Nation, and whatever may divide us in the House this evening, the message we communicate to Colonel Lane and to those who might inflict harm upon his soldiers is that once Americans go to war, we come together as a Nation. The resources necessary to accomplish the mission, those requested by the field commander, will be provided. Those are the elements of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I urge strong support for our soldiers. I urge an affirmative vote on the Buyer-Skelton resolution.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TIAHRT].

(Mr. TIAHRT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in favor of the Buyer-Skelton resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Buyer-Skelton resolution. The President has developed a policy committing our troops without the consultation of Congress or the consent of the American people. Young men like Kempty Watson and Todd Beeson, both from Arkansas City, KS, have been required to go above and beyond the call of duty.

Mr. Watson and Mr. Beeson, are not defending the border of this great country. Nor are they being required to defend the Constitution of the United States of America. There is no vital American interest in Bosnia. This mission is truly above and beyond the call of duty. They are heroes, as is every American who served in Bosnia. They serve regardless of the policy.

Watson, Beeson, and others, like those men and women who serve in the 1st Armored Division, follow the Commander in Chief and do so professionally like no others in the world.

This resolution supports all our fine men and women in the U.S. Armed Forces, 100 percent.

But this resolution also strongly opposed the policy the President has forced on the American public.

Mr. Speaker, I disapprove of the President's policy. There are many ways to lead the world, lead NATO, present peace, without putting our troops in harm's way.

Therefore I support the Buyer-Skelton resolution and our troops.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from American Samoa [Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA].

(Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to make a play on words with the issue that is now before this body. Mr. Speaker, I was moved by the remarks earlier made by the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM]. We share a similar sense of anger and frustration in our experiences as Vietnam veterans, although I was not a war hero like my good friend from California. But all I know is that we could have been among the 58,000 dead soldiers and sailors whose names are honored at the Vietnam Memorial.

Mr. Speaker, our problem with Vietnam, Lebanon, and Somalia was not because we did not have the resources to protect and sustain our troops. it was because of poor military planning and execution by both our civilian and military leaders here in Washington.

Mr. Speaker, I hope to God we will not have another Secretary of Defense make a confession to the world and to the American people that it was wrong for us to be in Vietnam. I consider it an insult to the names of every soldier who died in Vietnam to tell that to the faces of the parents and relatives of those who died there in Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious the Dayton agreement is not perfect. Our President has spoken well, given leadership. I ask that we sustain the Hamilton resolution with caution, as expressed by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON].

Mr. Speaker, I don't want to make a play on words with the issue that is now before this body.

I believe it is appropriate that Congress fulfills its constitutional responsibility by deliberating the merits of the resolution now before us.

Mr. Speaker, I was moved by the remarks expressed earlier by the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM]. We share a similar sense of anger and frustration in our experiences as Vietnam veterans, although I was not a war hero like my friend from California. But all I know is that we could have been among the 58,000 dead soldiers and sailors whose names are honored at the Vietnam Memorial.

Mr. Speaker, our problems with Vietnam, Lebanon, and Somalia was not because we did not have the resources to protect and sustain our troops.—It was because of poor military planning and execution by both our civilian and military leaders here in Washington.

Mr. Speaker, I hope to God we will not have another Secretary of Defense make a confession to the world and the American people—and that is after the fact, that the United States was wrong to be in Vietnam. I consider it an insult to the names of every soldier who died in Vietnam. Perhaps former Secretary McNamara should tell that to the faces of the parents and relatives of those brave soldiers who gave their lives because of misguided policies that our political leaders dreamed up here in Washington.

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that the Dayton agreement is not a perfect document, and I sincerely hope our President will not be blinded by the concerns appropriately addressed by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHELTON].

Mr. Speaker, it is quite obvious that our President is not running an opinion poll or is trying to compete in a popularity contest. I commend our President for his global leadership on this important issue.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to support the Hamilton resolution, but to recognize also the concerns raised earlier by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHELTON].

Mr. Speaker, without United States leadership and participation, no peace is possible in Bosnia.

For nearly 4 years, a horrifying war has torn Bosnia apart. The world has witnessed the murder of 250,000 innocent men, women, and children there, while over 2 million people have been forced from their homes and made refugees.

Yesterday, like many other members, I was deeply touched by Israeli Prime Minister Shimon Peres' address before Congress. Prime Minister Peres noted the United States has saved the world

from three of its greatest menaces: German Nazism, Japanese Militarism, and Soviet communism.

In honoring America, Prime Minister Peres stated, ''You did it. You brought freedom. You defended it. Even in this very day, as Bosnia reels in agony, you offered a compass and a lamp to a confused situation like in the Middle East. Nobody else was able or ready to do it. You enabled many nations to save their democracies even as you strive now to assist nations to free themselves from their nondemocratic past.''

''America,'' stated Prime Minister Peres, ''In my judgment, cannnot escape what history has laid on your shoulders, on the shoulders of each and every one of you. You cannot escape that which America can alone do. America alone can keep the world free and assist nations to assume the responsibility for their own fate.''

Mr. Speaker, Prime Minister Peres has it right. Throughout history, America has always stood for peace and freedom and what is right. In Bosnia, we and our allies are not going to fight a war, but to protect a peace.

Without American Leadership, there would be no peace agreement. Without American troop participation, this peace agreement will not be carried out. As the leader of the free world, America cannot shirk its responsibility to end the suffering in Bosnia, to stop the spread of war to Europe, and to ensure a lasting peace.

The President has committed the United States to the Bosnia mission. As former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger recently stated, ''I now believe that if we do not honor the President's words, the threat to our security would be greater because nobody would believe that we are capable of conducting a serious foreign policy.

Mr. Speaker, with American leadership and credibility on the line, we cannot just cut and run from our duty to lead. It is time that we support our President and our troops in providing light and hope to this dark part of the world.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of our time to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER], the gentleman who has served as the conscience of this Congress on the carnage in Bosnia.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky). The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 4½ minutes.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, in August 1990, Saddam Hussein invaded Kuwait. The President, a few days later, determined that he would deploy troops to oppose aggression in the Persian gulf, and we as a Nation and as a Congress were united in that deployment. That deployment occurred during August, September, October, November, and December, and over 400,000 troops were sent. The Democratic leadership and the Republican leadership stood together in support of that deployment to oppose aggression.

We did so as a united nation. Yes; there was a vote in January as to whether to go to war, and in a bipartisan vote we determined that the President would have the authority to do so. The President acted, and the Congress shortly thereafter, some few days, passed a resolution, with over 400 of us voting to support the troops and their success.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is in our national interest to participate in the effort in Bosnia for several reasons. First, our President has told our allies and the warring parties that we would do so. America's credibility and our leadership in the world would be severely undermined if we do not.

The risk for peace is one that the Western alliance and the United States should be willing to take now and in the future. The NATO alliance under United States leadership remains, my colleagues, the stabilizing force in Europe, and it must be kept ready, united, and maintain its will to deter aggression and establish peace.

I suggest to you, my friends, it would be immoral to stand by in the face of the carnage and the rape and the murder and the genocide and the tragedy that is Bosnia.

My colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle, my fellow Americans, if you will, President George Bush recently stated:

> It is in our national interest to maintain the integrity of the United States; credibility in the world. If the President shifts direction now or if it is seen that the President does not have the support of Congress, our standing as leader of the free world and the standing of NATO would be dramatically diminished.

President Bush concluded his remarks by saying ''That must not happen.''

I will oppose the Buyer-Skelton resolution. They are men of integrity, and they serve their people well. But I am not opposed to the President's policy. It is not my policy. I wanted to lift the arms embargo. I wanted to give to the Bosnian people the right and the ability to defend their homes. I think President Bush and President Clinton were wrong in not supporting that policy. But the issue today is that the President has chosen a policy, and it is not Somalia, where there was no agreement among the warring parties, it is not Lebanon, where there was no agreement among the factions. It is a place in this world where parties brought together by the President of the United States have agreed on peace.

□ 2145

I believe it is worth a risk for peace.

I hope many of my colleagues were here yesterday. Shimon Peres spoke to a joint session of Congress. He said to us, as a country, that we saved freedom. He went on to say that wars did not cause us to lose heart, triumphs did not corrupt us, and we remained unspoiled because we rejected the spoils of victory.

He then talked about the risks for peace taken by his friend Yitzhak Rabin and his country, and he observed that just a few years ago he could not have conceived of reaching out to Yasser Arafat, a Palestinian, his enemy of centuries. Not the Arab and the Jews. For centuries. And now he believes there is a chance for peace, and he said that it was worth risking peace because it was more important to win the peace than to win elections.

Mr. Speaker, I think that is the decision our President has made. That is the decision I will support, and that is why I will oppose this resolution.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Missouri, [Mr. SKELTON], for a dialog.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman, does he agree with me that there has been no credible answer or response to my raising the issue of arming and training the Bosnian Moslems, which puts our troops at risk?

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I would respond to the gentleman that there has been no credible response in this debate to his question.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois, HENRY HYDE, for the perspective of a former commander of the naval reserves, a hero of World War II.

(Mr. HYDE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, very simply, this is a good resolution. It does two things: It expresses the dissent that so many of us feel from the policy implemented by the President in Bosnia. That is all it does.

It does not cut any funds, as the Dornan resolution did. In fact, it supports giving our troops all of the resources necessary to carry out their mission safely. So it fully expresses my own views, although I did support the Dornan resolution as the last, best, and only opportunity to keep our young men from going into this morass of ethnic and religious hatred that has been simmering for over 500 years on the off chance that they are out of breath now and they have a cease-fire.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution perfectly states my views in opposition but in support of the troops. So I strongly support and urge my colleagues support for the Buyer-Skelton resolution.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, let me extend a compliment to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TORRICELLI], for his demeanor and his statesmanlike conduct in how he has handled the debate. Just let me compliment the gentleman for that.

This is a debate about two very distinct views of foreign policy. There are those of us who tie the use of military

to vital national security interests because we believe that placing troops in harm's way on foreign soil is of no ordinary magnitude. The other is the Clinton administration would like for the United States to become the world's policeman and the guarantor of global security.

U.S. troops should only be used on the ground to ensure regional security, not to intervene in civil wars which have no real threat of spreading to that instability of a region. While I have heard the argument, it rings hollow.

The United States, as the world's only superpower must exercise a policy of restraint in our involvement in conflicts overseas. Ours is a responsibility to provide overall military and economic security to regions of the world. If the United States intervenes in intracontinental conflicts, regional powers are allowed to escape their responsibilities.

When will Europe take a role in policing its own region? The answer is when Europe no longer has the expectation that the United States will be there to rescue them whenever they have a problem.

Mr. Speaker, we are closing this century now. For the fourth time, the United States will be on the ground in Europe. Think of that, for the fourth time. Truly, Europe can be a quarrelsome bunch and the United States leadership in NATO unifies and strengthens Europe. But as my colleagues know, the United States must send a message that the post-cold-war policies and doctrine for the security of Europe must reflect 1995, not 1945.

The United States has a key and vital role to play in the peace process, and I compliment the President of the United States for bringing the parties to the table. The role for which we should play is do not put troops on the ground.

The United States should act responsibly in the cohesion of NATO; the IFOR commander should be a commander from Europe, not the United States. The United States should supply our air power, our seapower, our airlift, our sealift, our intelligence, the architecture of intelligence from the sky and our satellites and logistics, but not that on the ground. However, when U.S. forces deploy on the ground as peacekeepers, we go there without the protection of neutrality, and they become targets and casualties.

There are those who have claimed the moral obligation. Well, let me say this. When we view disasters in this country, whether it be by tornado, hurricane, earthquake, fire, you name it, we see that destruction and it is repulsive to us, but we understand it because we say it is a natural disaster. However, when we look and view what mankind can do to one another, it is violent to our values. But if we permit our foreign policy to be guided by our hearts, then the United States will find our troops in over 67 hot spots throughout the world.

If we want the United States to become the world's policeman, just say so. I do not believe that the United States can be the world's policeman.

When I was in Sarajevo, a mother, yes, cried and wept in my arms to communicate to me that she lost a son. That is moving to me. But it is also just as moving when I go to the funerals of American soldiers and have to be able to look into the eyes of an American mother and be able to communicate to her that her son or her daughter has given that life to protect vital national security interests. That is why we tie foreign troops' commitments to vital national security interests, because we cannot be everywhere in the world.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is very clear. It is clear because we say we are reiterating a policy from before, where we stated we oppose U.S. ground troops. We want to intervene, but we do not agree with that policy. We believe we have the confidence in these troops that they will do their job. They are gallant, they are brave and they are courageous.

We also do not want a repeat of Somalia. I have spoken with a father who lost his son. We do not want that.

We want the President and the Secretary of Defense to rely upon the field commanders when they make military decisions. We also want to make sure they get the resources and the equipment they need to do their job.

Last is a paradox, and that is if we are going to arm and train the Moslems, then we should take sides. And if we do that, then we do not go on the ground. If we want to go on the ground, then we do not arm and train the Moslems. But to do both or to claim that somehow we will get other countries to do it, and our pawprints are all over it, subjects and opens our American soldiers to become targets and casualties, and it is wrong.

Please support the Buyer-Skelton resolution. God bless us all.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, as the tragedy of the Balkan conflict has unfolded before us in the newspapers, on television, and here, on the floor of the House, I have spent many hours talking with constituents, talking to colleagues, and thinking through the appropriate United States response, as well as the appropriate role for Congress. I continue to believe that the deployment of U.S. ground troops is the wrong approach. I do think the United States has an interest in stopping the fighting and in preserving NATO. But I also believe that military instability in Bosnia and Herzegovina presents tantamount risk to our ground troops and throws into question the achievability of our mission there. A more appropriate U.S. role might have been limited to logistical support and providing air cover.

It is, of course, crucial that Congress voice its support for our troops, for our young men and women who are already in Bosnia. And as much as I disagree with President Clinton about some of his foreign policy decisions, I think when you elect a President as Commander in Chief, you have to give some flexibility.

Tonight I will reluctantly vote against H.R. 2770, Representative DORAN's bill to cut off all funding for our troops, primarily because I think it is not fair to our men and women in uniform who are already there. It would be irresponsible for Congress to jeopardize the safety of those already deployed and the thousands more that are in the process of being deployed—regardless of this vote—in the coming weeks. I think of Annah Castellini, a constituent and graduate of West Point, who is headed to Bosnia soon as a platoon leader. Remembering the Vietnam era, she worries about whether the American people will support her.

Further, I do feel that the passage of H.R. 2770 begins to infringe on the President's power as Commander in Chief and could threaten confidence in U.S. leadership. I think it would be unwise at this time to send conflicting messages to the factions of the Balkan conflict and the rest of the world.

In my opinion, the Buyer resolution, House Resolution 302, strikes a better balance between opposing the decision to send them, yet supporting our troops in their duties. I will support Buyer. I cannot support House Resolution 306, the Hamilton resolution, because it implicitly expresses support, not just for the troops, but also for the President's decision to send them.

Former President Bush said recently, ''Sincere people can have honest differences as to whether President Clinton has made the right decision. I am nevertheless certain in my mind that at this point we must support our troops—and that support should come from Republicans and Democrats alike.'' I agree. As one who believes President Clinton made the wrong decision, I nonetheless will support our troops in any way I can and pray for their safe return.

Mr. TORKILDSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening in support of the resolution offered by my colleagues from Indiana and Missouri.

Earlier tonight, I voted against the resolution sponsored by my colleague from California because it sent the wrong message to our troops already in Bosnia, as well as those on their way in the coming days. We cannot take away their ability to defend themselves.

I strongly support the Buyer-Skelton resolution which expresses our opposition to the President's Bosnia mission. Yet, this resolution does so without undermining our troops already there, and those troops that will be there by the time this resolution is agreed to by both the House and Senate. This resolution specifically states that our troops in Bosnia will have the resources and support they need to protect themselves until we bring them home.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUNNING). Pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 304, the previous question is ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 287, nays 141, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 857]

YEAS—287

Abercrombie
Allard
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bentsen
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brewster
Browder
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bryant (TX)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chapman
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Collins (IL)
Combest
Condit
Cooley
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLay
Dickey
Doggett
Doolittle
Dornan
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (LA)
Fields (TX)
Filner
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Funderburk
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Green
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Lincoln
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Longley
Luther
Manton
Manzullo
Martini
McCarthy
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHale
McHugh
McIntosh
McKeon
McNulty
Menendez
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Minge
Molinari
Montgomery
Moorhead
Morella
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Ortiz
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Peterson (MN)
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Riggs
Rivers
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Salmon
Sanders
Sanford
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas
Thornberry
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Traficant
Upton
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wise
Wolf
Wyden
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zimmer

NAYS—141

Ackerman
Baesler
Barr
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Berman
Bevill
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Cardin
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Coyne
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoke
Houghton
Hoyer
Jackson-Lee
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Klink
Klug
LaFalce
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lowey
Maloney
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McDermott
McKinney
Meehan
Meek
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran
Murtha
Myers
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Petri
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Quillen
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Richardson
Rohrabacher
Rose
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sawyer
Scarborough
Scott
Sisisky
Skaggs
Slaughter
Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Thompson
Thornton
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Williams
Wilson
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates
Zeliff

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Bateman

NOT VOTING—4

Lucas
McInnis
Tucker
Velazquez

□ 2214

Mr. SCARBOROUGH changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I wish unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the resolution just considered, and that I may include extraneous material for the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. BUNNING). Pursuant to section 4 of House Resolution 304, it is now in order to consider a resolution offered by the minority leader, or his designee.

□ 2215

SENSE OF HOUSE REGARDING DEPLOYMENT OF ARMED FORCES TO BOSNIA

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 304, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 306) expressing the Sense of the House of Representatives regarding the deployment of United States Armed Forces in Bosnia, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of House Resolution 306 is as follows:

H. RES. 306

Whereas the President of the United States pledged to commit the United States Armed Forces to participate in implementing a peace agreement in Bosnia and Herzegovina;

Whereas the United States hosted Proximity Talks in Dayton, Ohio, from November 1, 1995 through November 21, 1995, for the purpose of allowing the negotiation of a peaceful settlement to the longstanding conflict in the former Yugoslavia;

Whereas the Proximity Talks concluded with the Presidents of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Republic of Croatia, and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia initialing a General Framework Agreement for Peace on November 21, 1995;

Whereas the Presidents of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Republic of Croatia, and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia have requested a NATO-led implementation force with United States participation and have pledged full cooperation with this force;

Whereas some Members of Congress have questions and concerns about certain aspects of the peace implementation process; and

Whereas the Congress joins the President in wanting to minimize the risks to the United States Armed Forces helping to implement the peace agreement in the former Yugoslavia by ensuring that they have the necessary resources and other support to perform their mission effectively: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives unequivocally supports the men and women of the United States Armed Forces who are carrying out their mission in support of peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina with professional excellence, dedicated patriotism, and exemplary bravery.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 4 of House Resolution 304, the gentleman from Indiana, [Mr. HAMILTON], and the gentleman from New York, [Mr. GILMAN], each will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON].

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support House Resolution 306. It is a very simple and straightforward resolution. Its purpose is simply to support the troops and to praise them for the work they are doing and will do. It does two things in its operative clause. It gives unequivocal support to the men and women of the United States Armed Forces and praises them for the work that they are doing and will do in support of peace in Bosnia. The resolution is intended to be silent with regard to policy, and the whereas clauses of the resolution merely recite facts. The resolution is intended to be silent with regard to policy, neither for the policy

nor against it. It recites the historical facts without editorial comment.

The resolution does mention that all Members of this body have questions and concerns about the effort in Bosnia. It emphasizes that we want to do all that we can to minimize the risks to U.S. forces by ensuring that they have the resources necessary to perform their mission. So it only calls for unequivocal support of our troops. With all of the doubts and the questions and uncertainties that exist in this Chamber and in the country with respect to Bosnia, the effort here is to come forward with one certainty. That certainty is that we support the troops.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON].

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I feel constrained to speak against this in light of the fact that the last vote passed and it passed overwhelmingly. If this should happen to pass, we would have the most mixed message going out to America possible.

These are nice words. Paraphrasing them, they are pabulum. But we support the troops more than adequately in the previous resolution. We stated more correctly when we speak of their courage and of their professionalism in the previous resolution. This one would have no effect except to confuse the people we represent and of course confuse those wonderful troops that are going to be in Bosnia. I am constrained, Mr. Speaker, to vote against this.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LINDER].

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe there has been an issue in my 3 years here that the depth of feeling has been such as there is on this movement into Bosnia. I spoke to a group two Mondays ago and had a senior gentleman walk up to me, a businessman. He said, when the first person dies and comes back in a body bag, it will be because of what we did not do yesterday. I said, what was that? He said, you did not speak out in opposition.

This is a very, very dicey prospect. I have heard Members compare this movement to what happened in Vietnam 20-plus years ago. I said this is not Vietnam. This is Afghanistan. It is much, much more dangerous. This war has been going on since 1389. C.B. Hackworth, the most decorated military officer still alive in this Nation, led a group, he said recently on television, into this very area for 1 year, for 1 year in 1949, and they came out 9 years later.

I honestly listened to the President's speech on this subject with an open mind a couple of Monday nights ago because I had to speak about it on radio the next morning. I thought he gave a good speech, but he always gives a good speech. So the next morning I got up early and I read what he said. It was much different in black and white than it was on a TV picture tube. What he said essentially was that Americans should be for peace. Are we not? I thought that was inane.

Then he said, we must do this out of respect for NATO. My colleagues, NATO is a very large military bureaucracy with nothing to do. It is looking for something to do. My judgment, it is time to recognize that NATO expired in August 1989. It is time for us to give it a decent burial with full military honors and find a new policy and a new arrangement because the old threats are no longer there.

I read the Hamilton resolution. I understand the purpose of it. But if it is anything different in terms of support for the troops than we just voted for, why does it not say, we support the policy? Why does not the President's own party say, we support the policy? Does anybody support the policy?

It does not say that, but there are fine words in here that would let the President tomorrow draw an inference that indeed we do. It says here that the House unequivocally supports the men and women of the United States Armed Forces carrying out their mission in support of Bosnia. I am absolutely convinced that the President can construe that to mean tomorrow that we support the policy. My colleagues, this is not our time. This is not our place. This is not our war. This is the wrong resolution.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR], distinguished whip.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot of emotion on this floor tonight and it is not hard to understand why. The decision to commit troops is one of the toughest decisions any of us will have to make. And none of us takes it lightly.

There comes a time when America—and only America—can lead. Now is one of those times.

For 4 long years, we watched as 250,000 people were killed, 16,000 children were slaughtered, and nearly 3 million people were left homeless in Bosnia.

And through it all, there has been very little reason to hope. But finally, peace is at hand.

Finally, we have a real chance to end the bloodshed. For the first time in 4 years, there is hope in Sarajevo because there is faith in America.

And I, for one, am proud of the fact that American troops are saving lives tonight in Bosnia.

For 220 years we have sent American men and women overseas, not just to defend American interest, but to defend American values. To stand up for freedom and democracy and human rights.

And if those things are not worth defending any more then I do not know what America stands for.

The people of Bosnia are tired of war. They want peace, but they need help to keep the peace. America is not undertaking this mission alone. But only America can lead it.

As Shimon Peres said from the podium behind me yesterday: Only America can provide the compass and the lantern that the world so desperately needs in Bosnia today.

This century began with bloodshed in Sarajevo. And we have it in our power today to make sure that it does not end with bloodshed in Sarajevo.

I would hate to think that someday, historians will look back on this day and wonder why, when we had a chance to keep the peace in Bosnia, the House of Representatives turned its back and let the killing begin again.

We can avoid that fate here today. I urge my colleagues: support our troops. Support the President. And support this resolution.

□ 2230

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California, [Mr. RIGGS].

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to the distinguished minority whip, this resolution is much more or much less, depending on one's point of view, than an expression of support for our troops. As someone in the delegation that just returned from Bosnia last night, I have to say that that trip to that incredibly war-torn region raised more questions in my mind than it answered.

That is the problem with the Hamilton resolution. It glosses over those questions in one more ''whereas'' clause. Until we honestly address those questions and concerns, I do not see how this House can vote for the Hamilton resolution.

Let me just say what I think are the questions which absolutely need addressing in a forthright manner by every Member of this body. First of all, it is not clear if we have defined that criteria for ending this mission successfully, and I think we all know that an exit date is not an exit strategy.

Second, there is a very real concern in talking to the leaders of these three countries whether they are doing everything at this moment to stop war crimes as they promised to do in Dayton. Just look at the scorched Earth policy that the Croatians are carrying out in the areas they promised in Dayton to turn over to the Serbians.

There is also a very real concern whether we will be able to achieve greater equality between the heavily armed Serbian and Croatian forces and their underarmed Bosnian counterparts. That military parity, that greater equality, is absolutely essential to a lasting peace.

Lastly, we are in for an untold open-ended financial commitment here. The American people need to be told the true cost of this peacekeeping mission, all that it entails, including the economic and humanitarian assistance necessary to rebuild Bosnia.

So the Hamilton resolution comes up short. It does not address these questions and concerns. It glosses over them with another ''whereas'' clause, and the American people deserve better.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN].

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, tonight we are defining who America is and who we will be in the 21st century. Clearly we are a blessed Nation, protected on both sides by oceans, rich with natural resources, and, more importantly, rich with the diversity of immigrants driven by their pioneer spirit. But to whom much is given, much must be expected.

The Bosnians have cried out for American involvement for three and a half years, partly because we have more military capability than all the nations of Europe combined. But, far more importantly, they look to us because of our heroic character because they know that it was America's heart that saved Europe's soul; because they know that it was our grandfathers and our fathers who were willing to risk their lives, not for any selfish materialistic cause, but for the noblest of reasons, for the cause of human freedom, democracy, justice, and religious and ethnic tolerance.

It is precisely these same cause that are at stake in Bosnia today. We should not, in fact, we must not, profane the legacy of our grandfathers who saved Europe in World War I, or the legacy of our fathers who saved Europe from fascism in World War II and then set up NATO to prevent a World War III. But we would profane their legacy if we let the affluence and the comfortable security that their sacrifice has brought us weaken our resolve to uphold the principles that still define America.

Heroic leaders do not shrink from their moral instincts because their own personal security is not directly threatened. They act when they know that only they can make a difference. They act, because it is the right and the principled thing to do.

After a quarter of a million people have been slaughtered, 40,000 women have been raped, and 2.8 million people have been driven from their homes, it is the right and the principled thing to do to put a stop to this ethnic cleansing, the slaughter that will clearly continue, unless America shows its heroic character once again.

Our troops are the clear expression of our national heroic character, and that is why we should support them by voting for the Hamilton resolution.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD].

(Mr. PACKARD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, having just returned from Bosnia and having met with each of the three Presidents and many of the other leaders of the different factions there, I came away convinced that the leaders do not understand the peace agreement, the Dayton accord, the same way. Each of them looks at it differently. There are serious misunderstandings among the leaders that put their initials on the accord and will be signed perhaps tomorrow.

Those differences are major and significant differences. If they exist among the leaders, they surely will exist among the people. The expectations of the people and the leaders there of the United States is that we will be much more involved in the cost, the payment, and the providing of different activities than what the peace accord calls for.

Some of them feel that we will be responsible as Americans to pay for many things that we have no responsibility to do. The refugees, the rebuilding, the building of the infrastructure, the paying for the free elections and for the many commissions that this peace accord calls for, they expect the American people, the American taxpayers, to support all of these functions. Yet that is not the intent of the accord and the American people are not expected to do so.

These confusing understandings from the leaders are not going to lead to a peaceful condition there. I foresee that peace will not come to that region, with or without the American troops. I do not understand how they can have peace with the feelings that they have. There are some that are today rejecting the peace accord.

Mr. Speaker, I think that it is a tragedy and a mistake for us to send troops there. I do not support the President's policy. This resolution implies support of the President's policy.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. CARDIN].

(Mr. CARDIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, for the past 4 years, we have witnessed systematic ethnic cleansing in the former Yugoslavia. The United States and its allies have done precious little. It is an outrage to humanity that Europe and the United States stood on the sidelines, watching the aggressors willfully violate international standards of human rights.

It can be argued that it is too late to help the people of Bosnia. That Sarajevo lies in rubble. That Europe is primarily to blame for the failure to act. That the United States should have exercised its leadership earlier. In my opinion, all of these concerns are true.

However, it is never too late to act to stop human atrocities. President Clinton deserves the international community's appreciation for bringing the warring parties together.

Although all of us hope these recent peace efforts will succeed, I have serious questions about this NATO mission. The territorial boundaries that have been agreed upon lack historical confidence. The will of the leadership in the former Yugoslavia for peace is uncertain. Yet, this agreement presents the only hope for peace and an end to the massive human rights abuses.

There are those who believe that we have no national interest in Bosnia. I disagree. Stability in the Balkans is important to a stable Europe and a stable Europe is important to the economic and security interests of the United States. It is also in the national interest to speak loudly against the continuation of ethnic cleansing.

Others say correctly that the United States cannot act in all parts of the world when human rights are violated. However, that should not be a justification for failing to act when we can.

Mr. Speaker, I have serious reservations about the military strategy of this mission. I am concerned as to whether the time table is reasonable and as to whether we can achieve peace. I am disappointed that the President has chosen not to precede under the war powers act, to seek congressional approval to send our troops to a foreign hostile area.

In addition, the house leadership has regrettably failed to allow us to consider a resolution, similar to what is being considered by the other body, which speaks to an appropriate exit policy. An appropriate exit policy clearly would ensure the arming and training of the Bosnian Moslems, the primary victims of aggression, It is imperative for NATO forces to exit the region with the Bosnian Moslems adequately prepared and knowing that a long-term NATO presence is not necessary because there is an equal military balance among the formerly warring factions.

However, the three resolutions that are before us today do not speak to these military concerns. Therefore, I voted against the rule in which these resolutions where made in order.

It is clear from court decisions that the President has the constitutional authority to commit U.S. troops to this mission. All of us, regardless of our views as to whether the President should commit the United States to the NATO implementation force, stand behind our troops, therefore, the only resolution that I can support is the Hamilton resolution which speaks to the support of our troops and points out concerns raised by Members.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GEJDENSON].

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the Members before voting take their responsibility seriously enough to read the Hamilton resolution. The Hamilton resolution states where we are. It states that the President has committed the troops. This House has refused to cut off the funding to place troops in the field by failing to support the Dornan resolution, the Dornan legislation, and so today before us the only solid support for the troops in the field comes from the Hamilton resolution.

Now, there are debates about the policy. I for one think the policy has succeed to date. The fighting has stopped, America has used its air power, as many argued that it could not, to bring the sides to the peace table. The President brought them to the United States and to Ohio, and achieved a ceasefire.

All of us are concerned about casualties. That is the only question that remains. If the Congress, House, and Senate, wanted not to send troops to Bosnia, they needed to vote to cut off the funding to make sure no troops would go there. In the Senate that was rejected some 70 votes to less than 30. In the House it was rejected as well.

So tonight, as we look at the opportunities for peace in the former Yugoslavia republic, the debate before us is a simple one: Do we or do we not support the troops as they enter that field of operation?

The Hamilton resolution resolves that the House of Representatives unequivocally supports the men and women of the United States Armed Forces who are carrying out their mission in support of the peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina with professional excellence, dedication, patriotism, and extreme bravery.

General Scowcroft and former U.N. Ambassador Fitzpatrick agree with that posture. They believe that America must fulfill this commitment. But today it seems some would like to have it both ways. They would like to wring their hands about the policy, say that they support the troops, but, on the other hand, take no real action.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me the only real action before us that we can consider today and seriously give support to our troops is not one that wrings its hands about the potential dangers that we are all concerned about. But if you read that Resolution 302 that was read, it does not state strong support for our military. I know the Members that voted for it meant to do it, but they have not done it, unless they vote for the Hamilton resolution.

Mr. Speaker, this is the right thing to do tonight. The question of the security and safety of our men is one that will stay with each and every one of us for the time they are in the field. But the right thing to do as they go off is to give them the support of this Congress as this Congress gave its troops support as they entered Desert Storm.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution before us has been carefully crafted. I urge my colleagues to read it throughout. Although carefully written, I believe it is flawed. Not so much for what it says, but for what it fails to say. It fails to state what a majority of this House believes—that our troops are being deployed on a seriously flawed mission.

We all fully support our troops, strongly unequivocally. the vote we just concluded unmistakably demonstrates that.

I urge our Members not to weaken that message. Accordingly, I submit that the Hamilton resolution is redundant and should be defeated.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY].

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, voting whether or not to send American troops abroad is the most difficult decision that any Member of Congress will ever face.

I still have questions and concerns about our exit strategy and about the dangers our troops will face on the ground in Bosnia. The peace agreement we will help enforce is not perfect. The risks and the dangers are real.

But what is the alternative?

We have all been horrified at the events in Bosnia over the last several years. Mass executions. Torture. Systematic rape. Ethnic cleansing.

For the past 3 years, we called for an end to the horrors. We condemned. We impose sanctions and embargoes. We bombed.

And finally the prestige and the armed might of America brought both sides to the negotiating table to achieve peace.

So what now, now that peace is won?

Will we turn our heads and look the other way as Central Europe descends further into barbarism? Will we shut our eyes to the ethnic cleansing and the genocide? Will we walk away and doom this peace agreement to failure?

We dare not. Make no mistake: Refusal to send United States troops to Bosnia will end the peace. There will be no peace without the leadership of the United States.

Some argue that we have no national interest at stake in Bosnia. I must disagree.

We have a national interest in assisting and supporting our NATO allies. We have a strong national interest in preserving peace in Central Europe. And we have a compelling national interest in stopping ethnic cleansing and genocide.

At stake today is whether the United States will continue to assume a leadership role in the world, or whether we will retreat into isolationism. This debate is about our national character, our moral leadership

Mr. Speaker, the United States still stands for something very special in this world. Since World War II this Nation has maintained freedom's watch around the globe. We have paid a heavy price for our vigilance—but that is the price we must pay to ensure the success of liberty. We are the world's moral leader—and we must not shirk that leadership.

Our troops are the world's best. They are brave—and they are ready.

Mr. Speaker, we must help bring peace to Bosnia. The United States has the ability to respond, we have the obligation to respond, and we must respond.

Let's support this resolution. Let's support our troops.

□ 2245

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BAKER].

Mr. BAKER of California. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to speak here on this subject.

Mr. Speaker, our foreign policy is flawed. The State Department told us that the people of Yugoslavia could not get along, so we had to divide Yugoslavia. We set up Croatia, we set up Bosnia and we set up Macedonia. We broke up Yugoslavia because the people there could not get along.

But in Bosnia, the map makers, not unlike the gerrymanderers that ran this place for 40 years, drew an intricate map in Bosnia and said, these people are all going to live under each other and they will live in harmony and peace. And the killing goes on.

And the folks in Sarajevo took a poll, and the Serbians, who comprise about 33 percent of Sarajevo and have for 500 years, said we will not live under the Moslems. So they do not like the plan.

The Mujahedian, who have been imported from the Middle East, 4,000 strong, are there to protect Islam. And they do not care about us and they do not care about the Croatians and they do not care about the Serbians. They have a different agenda. But our state Department says, we are going to recognize this new central government and, by golly, they are all going to live in peace, and we are going to go there and enforce this peace. It is a flawed foreign policy.

If we really believe these people can live in peace, go back to one Yugoslavia and at least give them some territory, where Croatia, Serbia and the Muslims can live with some distance between them.

We used to have a resolution that said the President has asked us to support his policy and, mysteriously, that was dropped out of the resolution because now we have nothing left but pretty words. Now we say, we, some Members of Congress, have questions. We have reservations.

I cannot get up the first question when I try to make a list of questions, and that is, how the heck do we get out of here? How do we keep from being enmeshed in this quagmire that has gone on for 500 years? How do we save the lives of our young men and women? This Democratic alternative is a fig leaf under any word.

Please vote no.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

(Mr. VENTO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Hamilton resolution, and I think the Members of this body ought to support it, too.

We had our vote on cutting off the funds; and we said we did not want to cut off the funds. Now we are suggesting we are going to send a mixed message. I suggest some in this body want to have it both ways.

We suggest that we want a peace accord that has no risk. If there were no risk, we would not need military troops in Europe; we would certainly not need them in Bosnia.

Surely, there is risk involved in this, but the fact is, we did not start this

foreign policy in November of 1995, such as the resolutions that many Members referred to were initiated at that point. In fact, of course, the commitments in this particular instance, in Bosnia, Yugoslavia, go back to the former administration, and certainly at least 2 years with this administration.

No, the right posture here is to vote for this resolution to provide the type of support and to understand that, indeed, there are risks. There are going to be incidents. There are going to be accidents. We should be very concerned about it, but the goal they are trying to accomplish is a reasonable one and one that this Nation should stand behind, Mr. Speaker.

I rise today to support both our peace-meeting troops and the decision to commit them in support of the Bosnian peace agreement. The conflict in Bosnia has brought many images of pain and suffering. Reports indicate that over 200,000 people have been killed in the conflict, mostly civilians as well as military personnel. Millions of people in Bosnia were forced to leave their homes in this war on civilians and cities. In fact an estimated half the population are refuges. Now with American leadership, and the demonstrated re-energized military capacity in Croatia and Bosnia this past spring, negotiations have led to a peace agreement that offers hope to the people of the Balkans. In order to monitor this agreement and create the basis for a lasting peace, the United States and its NATO allies have been asked by the parties involved to contribute a peacekeeping force and have agreed to enforce the peace.

Because of the instability caused by the Balkan conflict, repercussions from a continued conflict go far beyond the Balkans and threaten United States interests in all of Europe, Greece, and Turkey. This area has been freed from the control of communism and now faces the re-emergence of ethnic and religious tensions, and an unpredictable and dangerous nationalism. The harsh conflicts among peoples and nations in this region seriously risk the new found liberty and the hope of a lasting peace. In such a situation, an opportunity to bolster peace cannot be discarded, especially in light of the past 4 years of suffering.

The Dayton peace agreement gives the U.S.-led NATO forces the ability and authority to accomplish their mission of peace. I support this peacekeeping operation as it is truly a peacekeeping mission. Our peacekeeping forces will be in a dangerous environment, but one in which the parties have agreed to a peace settlement. This separates and establishes a distinct difference with the deployments in Lebanon or Somalia, and the Persian Gulf action, which in essence was a full fledged action to repel Iraq.

The Dayton peace agreement provides for the withdrawal of foreign parties, the removal of heavy weapons, and the reduction in the numbers of forces and such material. Important negotiations will further define and limit armaments and armed forces in the region. Hopefully the militaries can be built down to an improved parity; instead of built up for future instability and conflict.

Ironically, the insistence by some to condition their support on United States assurances of supplying and training of the Bosnian Moslems may in fact compromise the neutral role that the United States seeks to offer as peacekeepers. This factor could indeed raise the risks associated with the U.S. peacekeeping role, and that apparent risk initially has caused significant angst by the same Members of Congress who promote the training and supplying proposal. This confuses and tends to contradict the issue they advance.

The decision to send U.S. troops is not one to be taken lightly. Each soldier's life is important, for family, friends, and our Nation. The troops being sent will have the ability to defend themselves. Their training has prepared them for this situation. No doubt there will be accidents and some incidents in which soldiers lives may be lost. I am very concerned but am hopeful that the Dayton protocols will work to prevent the loss of peacekeepers lives.

The mission of peace, given the circumstances shaped with American participation and support, is important and justifies this U.S. peacekeeping role and contribution. U.S. leadership is necessary to move the peace that has been started into a new future for the people of the region. I urge my colleagues to support the resolution offered by Representative Hamilton.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time we have consumed?

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky]. The gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] has 19½ minutes and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] has 15 minutes.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE], chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary.

[Mr. HYDE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, first of all, let me say why I oppose the well-meaning, but I think flawed resolution of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON]. It will be interpreted as fully supporting the President's policy. Even though it does not say so, and wisely so, I think that is the way the press is spinning it, as the Dornan resolution, cut off all the funds, a middle ground expressing opposition but supporting the troops in the Buyer-Skelton resolution; and this is the other edge of the spectrum, namely supporting the President.

But having voted for Buyer-Skelton and having voted for Dornan, mostly I cannot support this because purporting to cover the waterfront, it is very benign as to objections the whole policy. The language is, Whereas some Members of Congress have questions and concerns about certain aspects of the peace implementation process. I do not have questions or concerns, I oppose it, and so do most of the people; in fact, everybody who voted for Buyer-Skelton, because it said, we oppose the policy.

So to say we have questions and concerns is just too mild. It is too gossamer. It just does not cover it. So for that reason, I cannot support it, although otherwise it has good language supporting our troops; but the Buyer-Skelton resolution did that, too.

Now, clearly, Mr. Speaker, I oppose putting 20,000-plus troops in extreme and certain danger during what I believe to be a time-out in a series of wars that have been fueled by ethnic and religious hatreds, spawned centuries ago. But the key to all this is our national interest, our national interest.

Now, somebody has decided our national interest is not at play in Rwanda, even though millions of people have been killed, even though there is no democracy there, but our national interests are not involved. The same thing is true in the Sudan. Millions of people have been killed there, refugees, dislocations, starvation, racial and religious hatreds, but our national interests are not involved there.

So that becomes very important. And so we look at Bosnia-Herzegovina and we say, where are our national interests there?

By way of comparison, we look at Desert Storm and our national interests were clearly involved. We had a defined enemy, a potential nuclear power with other weapons of mass destruction out waging an aggressive war against Kuwait and putting at risk the major petroleum reserves in the world in the Persian Gulf. If Kuwait had fallen, Saudi Arabia would have fallen and the economies of the world would have been in the vice-like grip of Saddam Hussein.

So, for me, and I am not a particularly bright fellow, I could see our national interest bristling in that situation. And the President saw it and the President wanted to commit troops over there. But those of us with some institutional memory, not all, I am sure, remember the vote of January 12 of 1991 where we got 86 Democrat votes yes and 179 no, and not one Democrat leader supported President Bush.

I am not going to take the time, Mr. Speaker, to discuss the bills of impeachment, three of them, that were brought against President Reagan and President Bush by various people, as well as litigation. I have the bills of impeachment and I have the complaints in my office. But I would like to note parenthetically that one of the charges in the bill of impeachment against Reagan was the abuse of the United States press in perpetuating a disinformation campaign against Colonel Qadhafi of Libya during the summer of 1986. That, I think, is classic.

In looking over the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the debates over Desert Storm, and I grant Members they are not identical at all, one was war and this is peace, sort of. Sort of. We are going in with lots of armament, though, to protect. To enforce, not protect the peace. But our national interests, in my judgment, others may wish what they want or think what they want, were directly involved in Desert Storm.

Let me read from the debate what one of the gentlewomen from Michigan had to say, and I quote, and this is January 12, 1991, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I will give Members the pages if they want them, but here is what she said.

In a time of limited resources to rebuild our cities, feed and house our homeless, educate our young, why is this administration so eager to spend billions in a far-off land that will have no meaningful impact on resolving the social and economic problems confronting every American every day right here at home?

Another gentleman, who was recently a senatorial candidate in the far west, in a primary, says:

Today, a large American force sits uneasily in the Arabian desert. They do not have a clear idea why they are there, the American people do not have a clear idea why they are there, and Congress does not have a clear idea why they are there. Mr Speaker, if we learned anything from the military misadventures of the last 40 years, it is that U.S. military might should not be committed to battle without a clear statement of U.S. objectives and the broad support of the American people.

Another senatorial candidate from a State very near and dear to me. Here is what he had to say:

I certainly do not know that I could go up and tell someone who has lost a husband that it was more important for this Congress to show unity than patience. But I would hope that this Congress would not squander its constitutional birth right over some ambiguous possibility or partisan loyalty to any President, Democrat or Republican.

The ranking member on the Committee on International Relations was very clear when he said in that debate, ''We have a constitutional responsibility to vote at the time when and if the President concludes force is necessary. That decision must be made jointly.''

Then we have a gentleman from California, a long-standing member of the Congress, who said, and I quote:

I have not heard any of you say a single thing for which I would vote to send even one American to die. The only valid issue is whether to give Bush authority to order thousands, even tens of thousands to their death. For those who persist, it should suffice to point out the United States is insolvent. To increase our deficit and debt by over $50 billion should turn the most aggressive warriors away from combat.

Now, we have a man from Massachusetts, who is skilled in the field of telecommunications and others, and very articulate, and here is what he said:

No one could explain to me what the war in Vietnam was all about. I swore then that if I were ever in any position of power, I would do everything I could to assure that before any young persons were asked to lay down his or her life for our country, we would be able to explain to that young man's friends and family the reasons why. So far I have not heard any explanations that would satisfy the loved ones of the new generation who now stand poised to fight in the Persian Gulf. It is a shame.

MODIFICATION TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 306 OFFERED BY MR. HAMILTON

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be modified by deleting the preamble and all of the test before the resolved clause so that the resolution be modified by deleting the preamble and all of the text before the resolved clause so that the resolution would simply read, ''*Resolved,* That the House of Representatives unequivocally supports the men and women of the United States Armed Forces who are carrying out their mission in support of peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina with professional excellence, dedicated patriotism, and exemplary bravery.''

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. BAKER of California. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the gentleman who objected would permit me to explain why I made the request.

Mr. BAKER of California. Mr. Speaker, I think we can save a lot of time by saying in the Buyer resolution we have done this.

□ 2300

Mr. HAMILTON. Would the gentleman permit me to explain?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUNNING). Objection is heard.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas, Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE asked was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, this is a wrenching decision. It is a decision that will have to be made this evening in its purest sense. I beg to differ with my colleagues, because they are skating the issue. This is a weighty decision. I can respect the disagreement of colleagues; I cannot accept the hypocrisy.

The gentleman rose just a few minutes ago to ask that we go on record standing here tonight unequivocally supporting the men and women headed to Bosnia. The resolution just passed was one of hypocrisy, albeit I respect the diversity of opinion and certainly do respect all who would not want to put those in harm's way, but nowhere in the Buyer amendment did it say unequivocally, with no question, do we support the troops going to Bosnia.

I do not know about my colleagues, but I am not going home to my constituents, to the American people, for me to tell them that Shane Hadley and Dwayne Case and Jeffrey Burkette, Texans who are on their way to Bosnia, do not have my support.

So, I would ask those who have a difference of opinion than I might have who may have gone to Bosnia, as I did, who may have talked to the people there who said Americans are the only ones who could give peace, and my colleagues may not have gone, I simply say to my colleagues that we have a serious decision to make.

I would ask that my colleagues follow a little child. The Holy Ghost Catholic School, on December 11, in Houston, TX, asked me to join them to pray for our troops. They asked me as a Congresswoman to take their words to this House as they lit candles and prayed. They said, ''We support our troops. Will you do that, Congresswomen?'' And I said to them, as I said to our troops in Germany, unequivocally, this Congress will go on record.

My colleagues, I ask you to simply put aside the partisan politics. Let us join together and unequivocally support our troops.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to express my strong support for our young men and women who will be serving in Bosnia. They deserve our utmost support and admiration. They are on a mission of peace that is in the true spirit of what our country was founded on: life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

For the past several years, all Americans have been horrified by the atrocities that have occurred in the Balkans. Over this time, many different cease fires and peace agreements have come and gone. We all prayed for a European solution, but none was forthcoming. The time for American leadership has once again arisen.

As the leaders of the free world, we need to be part of maintaining a stable and secure Europe. We stepped in and made a difference in World War I. And, we saved Europe, and the world from tyranny by defeating Hitler in World War II. Now, as the 20th century draws to a close, our Nation must once again enter the European theater and promote freedom. We must learn the lessons of history and speak firmly and act decisively to create a lasting peace.

I was part of the first bipartisan delegation to visit Bosnia, and have seen first hand the devastation there. I was told by the citizens of Sarajevo about the 3.2 million refugees, the over 200,000 people that have been murdered, and the over 6,000 elderly who have been left homeless. I am confident that our military will be able to meet the challenges that will be faced in Bosnia. I am confident because when I personally met with those troops who were in Germany and headed to Bosnia, they said that they were ready. However, they also said to me, ''We want the American people behind us.'' To those troops and the troops from Texas in particular—Shane Hadley, Dwayne Case, Jeffrey Burkette—I promise that I will work for that support.

The peace agreement has been negotiated with NATO as the military enforcer. As the leading power in NATO, and in the world, we have a moral and duty-bound obligation to work with our European allies in ensuring peace in Bosnia. This is not another Vietnam, and our troops will be able to defend themselves. We are the only Nation that has the technology and ability to deploy the large numbers of forces that are necessary to set up a large-scale military operation in a short amount of time. The Germans, the French, the British, and the Belgians have all failed. The citizens of Bosnia want us to help.

As 20,000 American troops prepare to depart for Bosnia, let us give our full support to this mission that is about peace, leadership, and stability. While our troops will work with

soldiers of other NATO countries, they will be under the leadership of an American commander at all times. Some would argue that we must ignore the problems of the world. But I say, let us be a part of a larger battle; the battle for human rights and justice.

I want to applaud the children of the Holy Ghost Catholic School in my home State of Texas who in their wisdom came together December 11 to pray for our troops. The children read letters, praying for peace. That's the true American spirit. I thank them for their courage, sincerity, and love of what America stands for.

We in Congress have a very difficult decision to make tonight, but it is not a decision to send troops to war. It is rather a decision to uphold the ideas of democracy, to stop the shooting and the slaughter; to clear the way for peace.

Like the children of the Holy Ghost School, we should stand up and give our troops our support tonight. And we should pray for peace and pray for the safety of our young men and women.

My colleagues, I implore you to support our troops, support the President, support what is morally right, and above all, put an end to the madness. Support the Hamilton resolution, House Resolution 305.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Indiana knows that I have high regard for him. So I took your last resolved clause, and I personalized it. Because I am going to vote against the amendment, but I am going on the record with a single, ''I person'' version of your resolved.

''I, Congressman ROBERT K. DORNAN, unequivocally support the 151 men,'' there are no women in there yet, ''of the United States Armed Forces who are carrying out this near-impossible mission in support of temporary peace in a gang fight in Bosnia and Herzegovina with their Reagan-trained professional excellence, dedicated patriotism, and exemplary bravery, that they will be called upon to show if they start stepping on land mines or start taking sniper fire.''

That is about it. I support that. I just came back from the Senate. Only 7 Republicans out of 53 voted against the amendment offered by KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON and JIM INHOFE. Only seven. Mr. Speaker, 46 voted for it, and 1 Democrat who has a tough election coming up.

Over here, the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BUYER], 287. That is about as strong a support for the troops as the gentleman from Missouri, IKE SKELTON, whom the troops love, chairman of Subcommittee on Military Personnel, exemplary Member, loves the men and women in uniform. And the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BUYER] is not only supporting the troops, he is one of the troops. He has been with them in dangerous areas.

Mr. Speaker, I beg my colleagues tomorrow to get that top intelligence briefing, and I want my colleagues to look at this this way. If you were a young man in Bosnia and you were a Moslem and you had a country in the United Nations that the United States and the European Union recognized as a nation on April 7, 4 years ago this coming April, and suddenly your country is cleaved in half, partitioned, and your sister was raped for 3 days by 50 people and then set on fire and burned alive, are you going to write it all off and keep the peace? I would not, and neither would my colleagues. And grudges are going to be filled out, these blood debts, after we are gone.

I predict we will keep some sort of a peace for 10½ months and then they will all come home, and Clinton will roll the dice trying to get reelected.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. POSHARD].

(Mr. POSHARD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POSHARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Hamilton resolution.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS].

(Mr. OWENS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Hamilton amendment. The deployment of American troops in Bosnia is a very serious undertaking. It is a very risky action. As policymakers, it is appropriate that we move with reluctance and hesitation, but this serious risky action is a vitally necessary action.

Military criminals, thugs with weapons of mass destruction, should not be allowed to butcher innocent thousands of civilians as they recklessly grab for power. On Tuesday in this Chamber, Prime Minister Shimon Peres of Israel paid tribute to America with the following words:

> As the end of this twentieth century is nearing, it can verily be described as the American century. The United States has built strength and used it to save the globe from three of its greatest menaces: Nazi tyranny, Japanese militarism, and the Communist challenge. You saved freedom. You enabled many nations to save their democracies, even as you strive now to assist many nations to free themselves from their nondemocratic past. You fought many wars. You won many victories. Wars did not cause you to lose heart. Triumphs did not corrupt you. You remained unspoiled, because you rejected the spoils of victory.

End of quote by Shimon Peres.

The American people and its armies should not again and again be called upon to make great sacrifices in order to save the civilized world. Our Nation should make it known that American resources and American soldiers will not always be available for every just cause.

But Bosnia, we have a most appropriate time to respond. This is a landmark in modern civilization. Our troops are being deployed within the context of a well-developed blueprint for peace. Our troops are being deployed to smother and contain the virus of ethnic cleansing and racism. Our troops are being deployed to provide an opportunity to survive for hundreds of thousands of grieving men, women, and children. Mr. Speaker, I urge a ''yes'' vote on the Hamilton amendment.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time we have consumed?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman fro New York [Mr. GILMAN] has 9–½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] has 11 minutes remaining.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. KIM].

(Mr. KIM asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.}

Mr. KIM. Mr. Speaker, I have a high respect for our ranking member the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], but I rise in opposition to this resolution.

We are missing the discussion here tonight.

First, it goes without saying that everyone in Congress strongly supports America's troops.

In every speech and in every resolution we have passed about Bosnia, this Congress has gone on record of providing unquestionable support for our troops.

We just passed a resolution with the same language supporting our troops.

This resolution does not address the underlying policy issue. But, while I support our troops, I have serious reservations about the underlying policy that is sending these troops to Bosnia.

By silencing any policy concerns, this resolution is sending a confusing, mixed message. It might be used by some to claim that there is congressional support for this Bosnia questionable adventure. That claim would be totally inaccurate—but they would cite this resolution.

This resolution does not address 3 important questions:

First, why should the United States provide over one-third of all the NATO troops? Many NATO countries are sending as few as 500 troops. Why 20,000 Americans, the lion's share?

Second, why don't we just provide logistical and support troops like Germany—and Germany is only sending 4,000 supporting troops.

Third, why are we sending troops to Bosnia when the American public is overwhelmingly opposed to this operation? In my office alone, the calls are 100 to 4 opposing the deployment of troops.

Again, we all strongly support the troops, it's the policy we question and we cannot afford to send a mixed message as this resolution would surely do.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FATTAH].

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Speaker, I think, unfortunately, some with this obsession to embarrass the President are

going to cause the House to embarrass itself. When the American troops land in Bosnia, there is going to be no doubt by those who face some 20,000 well-armed, well-trained American troops what American policy is. We only confuse ourselves by this action that we are engaged in this evening.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that we would support the resolution in front of us. It is difficult to understand the contradiction where we could stand and give a round of applause to the Prime Minister of Israel as he talked about taking risks for peace, and then given our own opportunity here this evening, we would muffle our message about what our role is in Bosnia.

The President has taken the leadership. This Congress has refused to eliminate funds for those troops. Therefore, the result is that our troops are going to be there. They are there to enforce a peace and that peace is well worthy of the best of America's efforts.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TIAHRT].

(Mr. TIAHRT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the Hamilton resolution, not because those who are supporting it voted against the Defense Appropriations Act, but I am voting against it because it is going to be misinterpreted as supporting the President's policy.

Mr. Speaker, I do not support the President's policy. I sat in Zagreb in a hotel after being in Bosnia, in Sarajevo, and I talked to Marine Lt. Col. Mark Sifford and his wife, Marianne. They have 3 children. He is going to spend his Christmas in Sarajevo away from his family. The question that his children have are, ''Why is Daddy not going to be home?'' Why are we sending our parents of these kids at Christmastime to a war-torn country? What is the reason? What is the vital American interest? Why are we defending this?

I think there are many ways to lead the world, but sending our men and women is not one of them. We can lead in many ways.

Mr. Speaker, I have with me this coin from the 1st Armored Division. It was given to me by Sgt. Kempty Watson. He has a mother that has been crippled by a car accident. He is the only son that she has. We are sending American sons to defend them. It is a failed policy. I oppose the policy. Vote against Hamilton, because it will be misinterpreted.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TORRICELLI].

□ 2315

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, in a few moments when this debate ends, the lights are dimmed across the country, thousands of American families are still going to sit in fear for those they love who are in our Armed Forces. They need to know that we are a proud and a very grateful Nation. They also need to understand the historic nature of this mission.

When the 20th century concludes, Mr. Speaker, we will close the chapter on nearly 300 wars. Despite all of our science and our culture and the advances of our times, this has been the most deadly period of human history. Our troops go to Bosnia to preserve the peace, to end the genocide, but also because they are the best hope that the future is going to be different from the past. In the Persian Gulf we proved that the world could fight together for justice. In Bosnia we proved that we can stand together to preserve the peace.

Mr. Speaker, we all wish that it could be different. But the lessons of European wars still burn in our memory. And there have been too many nights in too many churches and too many synagogues where we prayed that never again would the world experience genocide. Now we are left with the question, did all of that have meaning? Those memories stay with us for a reason. Yet my colleagues argue that it is not fair, it is not right that America should bear the burden.

Mr. Speaker, it has never been fair. It was not fair in Flanders. It was not fair in Okinawa or Normandy.

Mr. Speaker, we are not everybody else. We are Americans. We have never accepted history. We have changed it. Others might accept 250,000 people dying in their homelands. Other people might see genocide and slaughter and learn to look away. We are different. That is a difference that I am grateful for every day.

The determination of those who sat in this Chamber before us, colleagues who were here before us, led to a triumph of democracy in the world in the 20th century. My colleagues, if we have the same determination, if we have the same strength, we can lead to the triumph of peace in the 21st century. That judgment, Mr. Speaker, holds in the balance.

Mark Twain once said that in a world where physical courage is so common, it is tragic that moral courage should be so rare. Our troops have the physical courage to answer the call of our Nation. In the Hamilton resolution we determine whether we have the moral courage to lead, whether, indeed, Mr. Speaker, we are equal to those who answer the call of our country tonight.

I urge support of the resolution.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICA].

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, this measure asks us to ignore the policy. My colleagues, how can we ignore the policy? How can we ignore this ultimate policy failure of this administration and this President? How can we ignore the failed policy of Somalia that turned a humanitarian mission into a nation-building fiasco that left dozens of Americans dead and United States taxpayers still paying billions?

How can we ignore the failed policy of Haiti, where we sailed into Port-au-Prince Harbor, retreated, imposed an embargo on the poorest of the poor, sat by while the opposition was exterminated? We destroyed any shred of the economy and we spent and we are spending billions and billions, only to watch 1,100 flee just in the last few weeks and dozens die at sea because of our policy. And we are still paying billions.

How can we tonight ignore the failed policy of Rwanda where this administration ignored Butros Bugalis who begged and pleaded for action to avoid a slaughter of three-quarters of a million people and they died. And then we sent troops and then we spent millions.

How can we tonight deny and ignore a failed policy where for 3 years Bosnians begged us to change our policy? This week is Sarajevo, a Bosnian leader said to me, we did not ask for your troops. We asked for the policy to allow us to defend ourselves.

Where was our policy when 12,000 Sarajevo men, women and children were slaughtered? I saw the countless graves across the landscape of Sarajevo just in the last few days and another quarter of a million people were killed in the Balkans. Where was our policy?

Bosnians ask me, where was our policy when the U.N. told Bosnian citizens at Srebrenica to lay down their arms and their women and children are slaughtered. How tonight can we ignore this policy?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky). The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] has 6 minutes remaining and has the right to close, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COLEMAN].

(Mr. COLEMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, because this Congress must stand for a clear policy, I rise in support of the President's policy to keep the peace in Bosnia, and I rise in support of the Hamilton resolution.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. EDWARDS].

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday night near midnight, I said goodbye to several dozen soldiers from my district leaving their families to go to Bosnia. It was not easy. It was not easy for me to say to them face to face that I had serious reservations about this mission.

To their credit, they were not bothered by that admission from me. Because I said one thing they could count on is just as Congress after a vote on Desert Storm came together and in support of our soldiers, you could be assured that Congress, after our votes on conscience, would come together to support our troops.

Yet I am ashamed that because of the action of one Republican Member of this House tonight we will be denied the opportunity to show unanimous support for our troops.

Let me read to the American people what that one Member kept us from being able to vote on tonight.

Resolved that the House of Representatives unequivocally supports the men and women of the United States armed forces who are carrying out their mission in support of peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina with professional excellence, dedicated patriotism, and exemplary bravery.

It is shameful we will not have the opportunity to vote on that tonight.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG], distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on National Security of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, one of the earlier proponents of the President's policy used the word ''hypocrisy'' when referring to some of the statements on the Republican side of the House. The word ''hypocrisy'' called to attention something of interest to me; that is, how do we really support the American troops?

The real vote in supporting the American troops, the soldiers of our Nation, wherever they might be, came when we voted on the appropriations bill to pay for their training, to pay for their technology, to pay their salaries, their health care, their educational benefits, their quality of life. That is where we voted to support the American troops.

Hypocrisy, one after the other on this side who come here now to support the President's policy, most of them are the very Members who voted against funding training, technology, quality of life for our troops, and refused to support the troops, but they want to send them to Bosnia to get involved in a war.

Another of the speakers mentioned history. Let me say something about history. I read a statement to the President in the Cabinet Room a short time ago at a meeting. Subsequently that same day my distinguished minority leader read the same statement on the floor. Let me read it again just for a few seconds.

No language can describe adequately the condition of that large portion of the Balkan peninsula, Serbia, Bosnia, Herzegovina, and other provinces, political intrigues, constant rivalries, a total absence of all public spirit, hatred of all races, animosities of rival religions and an absence of any controlling power, nothing short of an army of 50,000 of the best troops would produce anything like order in these parts.

History, my colleagues. That was said by British Prime Minister Benjamin Disraeli in the House of Lords in August 1878, and history proved his wisdom.

Pray God that history does not prove this a disaster with Americans in Bosnia. We support our troops wherever they might be.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GANSKE].

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Speaker, I am going to oppose this resolution. Assistant Secretary of State Richard Holbrooke told me that to get this treaty signed he had to twist arms.

There is a statement in this resolution that is at the heart of my objections to the treaty. That has to do with full cooperation. As earlier this evening I said, after my visit to Bosnia, I had some serious reservations about the commitment. My impression is that there is a difference of commitment by the signers of this treaty on how to handle the refugees.

My impression is that there is clearly unhappiness by the participants about the territorial provisions. My impression is that there is major disagreement that will lead to significant lack of cooperation related to the rearming of the Bosnian Serbs.

Maybe this is why President Milosevic over cocktails with the Assistant Secretary, is quoted in the news magazines as saying, ''Richard, you are a BS artist.''

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BUYER].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BUYER] is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I wish I could stand here and support my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana. I cannot because his resolution obfuscates the issue. I can understand also why my colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. EDWARDS] came to the floor here upset because he also understands that all these whereas clauses in the Hamilton resolution makes it a flawed resolution. That is why so many are upset here today. This is not just one of these issues of just support the troops. This bill has a lot of flawed statements in it. We understand that.

Let me share with my colleagues, we have voted on this issue. We just voted on it. Let me tell Members what it says. It says that this Congress is confident that members of the U.S. armed forces in who it has the greatest pride and admiration will perform their responsibilities with professional excellence, dedicated patriotism, and exemplary courage.

We have just voted to support these troops. We will support these troops. We grow the defense budgets and provide for them every day and we will continue to do that in the future.

Do not support this resolution.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, [Mr. GEPHARDT], minority leader.

(Mr. GEPHARDT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEPHARDT. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

I simply wanted to explain why I was offering the unanimous consent that I did. The objection on the other side of the aisle has been that our resolution sent a mixed message, implied support, was redundant, obfuscated. None of those charges have been spelled out in language, but I take them as genuine concerns on the part of the other side.

□ 2330

So I wanted to strip all of that out and leave simply the language of unequivocal support.

Now, the striking thing about the Buyer-Skelton amendment is that the word support does not appear in it. Expressing confidence in the troops is not the same the Congress supporting the troops. If we finish our work tonight with the Buyer-Skelton resolution adopted and the Hamilton resolution defeated, we will have not supported the troops by a specific resolution of this Congress.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEPHARDT. I yield to the gentleman from Florida, who served 6½ years in a prison in Vietnam.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. First of all, let me say to my friend from Missouri, I did vote for the appropriations bill, so what I say is with that kind of support to the troops.

I served in Vietnam for a long time. I did not have a unanimous or, if you will, magnanimous, unequivocal support from this Congress while I served in Vietnam. The troops that are going to Bosnia will not have one either because of one objection. We have missed an opportunity to do a bipartisan, unequivocal support of our troops in Bosnia.

The only thing, incidentally, that General Crouch asked us to give him when we were in Freiburg, we asked what can we do for you? He said ''Give me something I can give to my troops that says you support them.''

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEPHARDT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to clarify, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] said there was nothing in the Buyer resolution to show support. On page 4 of that resolution, it says, '' * * * is furnished the resources and support that he needs to ensure the safety, support, and well-being of such members of the Armed Forces.''

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, let me say to the Members tonight, I think we have gone up and down the hill of whether this says support. The real important vote tonight was whether or not we would cut off the funds, and I know there were many Members in the body that voted to do that. I respect their vote.

Once that decision was made, we then had a resolution which set out

people's concerns about what was happening and did, I agree, set out a measure of support for the troops.

Our intent in presenting this resolution was not to change the editorial content, not to go back over the decision of whether or not we would cut off the funds but, as we did after the Persion Gulf debate in 1991, try to get a bipartisan, unanimous if we could, expression of this body that we support the troops, so that the people in the field leading the troops could have a piece of paper that would say unequivocally that the people of the United States, however they may be divided on what was happening and how it was happening, supported, without question, what they were doing.

We passed almost identical wording in 1991, 399 to 6. And I would ask the gentleman from Indiana, if we have an opportunity before we quit, to ask unanimous consent again, and I would ask the Members who wanted to object to rethink it, because I think it would be a good thing for us as a Congress tonight to say to our people there, who will be in harm's way, everybody agrees, we hope no one dies, we hope no one is injured, but that Congress in a bipartisan way wants to unequivocally say tonight, after all of our disputes have been settled one way or the other, that we stand behind our troops.

Let me just say one thing in closing, and then I will try to get out of the way so the gentleman can perhaps try to do this again. Alexis de Tocqueville once talked about America's morality. He said this:

> I sought for the greatness and generosity of America in her commodious harbors and ample rivers, and it was not there. I sought for it in her democratic Congress and her matchless Constitution, and it was not there. Not until I went into the churches of America and heard her pulpits flame with righteousness did I understand the secret of her generosity and power. America is a great country because she is good, and if America ever ceases to be good, America will cease to be great.

Ladies and gentlemen of the Congress, this is a good country, and it is a great country, and for all of our differences tonight on what is happening, we have made a choice not to stop this deployment. I ask the Members to try to come together tonight in a bipartisan way and in an unequivocal way to say to our troops, however we may differ about what is happening, we stand behind each of you through every minute and day of this great exercise.

Mr. DIXON. Mr.Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON]. No member of this body takes lightly the decision to place the lives of American troops at risk. In this case, I believe President Clinton has done his best to minimize the risk and there is strong justification for joining the NATO peacekeeping force.

People in the Balkan region have suffered greatly over the last 4 years as a result of the Bosnian conflict. In the quiet of our living rooms, we have seen and read about many of the horrors of the war. The killing of civilians, mass executions, and shortages of food, shelter, and other basic necessities have evoked outrage and sympathy from around the world.

Over the past few months, United States negotiators have succeeded in persuading the warring parties in Bosnia to agree to a peace plan. Now is not the time to turn our backs on the important role we play in the success of this agreement. The parties have agreed to tough compromises, yet it is the presence of the NATO peace implementation force that gives each party the confidence that the others will uphold their parts of the agreement. The United States must join its NATO allies in an effort to give the people of Bosnia the chance to peacefully coexist, build s democracy, and ensure that the horrors of war do not reoccur.

The United States has a vital interest in ensuring that peace in the region is sustained. Renewed war would not only exacerbate the suffering of the Bosnian people, the conflict could spread to nearby nations. Expansion of the war may draw us into a future conflict that requires a greater U.S. commitment—one which might not be limited to a peacekeeping role.

As a leader in the world and NATO, the United States must show willingness to work with our allies. Our participation in NATO has contributed to stability in Europe and to our victory in the cold war. NATO is an integrated military structure whose effectiveness depends on the United States, its largest member. Neglecting our leadership role in efforts to end the Bosnian conflict could erode our standing with our international partners and call into question our commitment to longstanding allies. We cannot afford to undermine those alliances.

The safety of U.S. military personnel on this mission is of paramount importance. I have been impressed with the administration's efforts to pursue a peace agreement that our military could implement and enforce. The mission has been narrowly defined and the President has ensured that the troops will be able to react with force if threatened. While there are risks to this mission, efforts have been made to minimize the possibility of harm.

We are all aware of the atrocities committed in this war. The United States has been actively involved in the peace process. Participation in the NATO peacekeeping is a final step we must take to give the parties in the Bosnian conflict a chance to live in peace.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker; I rise in support of the resolution offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON]. This well-considered resolution offers unequivocal support for the men and women of the U.S. Armed Forces as they prepare to carry out their mission in Bosnia.

My colleagues, over the last 4 years, more than half of Bosnia's prewar population has been murdered, starved, or driven out of their homes. With American leadership, a cease-fire has finally been brokered which will bring an end to Bosnia's suffering.

The Hamilton resolution acknowledges the questions and concerns that many members of the House have about this policy, but it affirms congressional support for our troops.

If we fail to keep our commitment in Bosnia, the credibility of our leadership elsewhere in Europe and throughout the world will be called into question.

I urge my colleagues to support our troops in Europe by supporting the Hamilton resolution.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge my colleagues to support the Hamilton resolution on American troops in Bosnia.

My decision on what is the proper course of action for the United States to take in this Balkan conflict is the most difficult one I have faced since coming to Congress. I have searched my conscience to do what is best for my country, understanding that many of my constituents do not support American troops in the Balkans.

I have been horrified by the violations of human rights that have taken place in Bosnia—the ethnic cleansing, the concentration camps, the rapes, the mass murders, the wanton military attacks against unarmed civilians.

At the same time, I could not support the provision of American arms for the Bosnian Moslems or Croats, because I feared it would lead to more killings, more disregard for human rights and human life.

This is a crisis that has defied easy answers. If there were a simple solution to bringing this bloodshed to an end, our European allies would have accomplished it.

They were not able to bring an end to this war and, are a result, the United States has lead the effort for peace, bringing the parties in conflict, at their request, to the negotiating table.

The President, in his capacity as Commander in Chief has exercised his constitutional authority. The Congress will now decide whether or not we will support American Troops, already being deployed on the Ground.

American troops deserve the unequivocal support of the Congress in this effort for peace, for peace, not war.

I recognize fully that there are risks attendant to this peace mission, but the United States of America must be on the side of peace and lead—demonstrate to the world that we can and will live up to our great heritage and place a moral force for peace on the blood-stained soil of the Balkans. The pursuit of peace must rise above the pursuit of reelection.

Two of the resolutions before us tonight do not provide complete support for American troops. The Dornan resolution purports to back our peacekeepers, but refuses to give them funds to do their job. The Buyer/Skelton resolution expresses confidence in our forces but undercuts the justification for their deployment.

Anything less than our total commitment to backing the women and men of the United States Armed Forces at a time when they are trying to bring peace to Bosnia injects politics, not statesmanship. While the United States of America cannot be a policeman of the world, we cannot be bystanders either. The exhortation ''Blessed are the peacemakers'' moves me to support this effort.

Only the Hamilton resolution expresses our support clearly and without reservation and I support it.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, tonight America stands at a crossroads. Tonight we must decide whether we are going to honor our global commitments and responsibilities, or are we going to retreat into the muddy waters of isolationism, turning our back on our friends and allies. Tonight, Mr. Speaker, this body

must decide if we are going to stand firmly behind our troops or are we going to point fingers and make a stance for political gain?

The choice is simple, Mr. Speaker, tonight we must act to honor our global commitments and stand firmly behind our American troops.

Mr. Speaker, the case for United States military involvement in Bosnia is clear, it is compelling, and it is credible. First, the Dayton Peace Accord is an American brokered peace agreement. Failure by the United States to participate in enforcing this agreement will greatly diminish American leadership and call into question the viability of NATO. Second, faith in our democratic ideals obliges us to act. Over 250,000 men, women, and children have died in this war, while 2 million more have been forced into becoming refugees through ''ethnic cleansing'' and torture. Third, American troops will make up one-third of a much larger contingent of British, French, German, Russian, and other troops whose mission it will be to enforce a peace agreement that the Presidents of Bosnia, Croatia, and Serbia have willingly entered into. Accordingly, the risk to these troops will be much less than if they were being used as combatants to militarily impose an American solution. Fourth, American participation now, will prevent the war from reigniting and spreading into neighboring NATO allies and struggling new democracies. Widespread conflict in Europe would threaten our security and require a far different and more costly American intervention in the future.

At stake, Mr. Speaker, is nothing less than the ability of the United States to influence, shape, and guide the complex forces that are tearing at the seams of not only the United States, but of the world. For, make no mistake about it, Mr. Speaker, a failure of the United States to share in the burden of enforcing the peace in Bosnia will be a direct abrogation of American leadership—leadership, that we have earned through the sweat and blood of hundreds of thousands of our young men and women, who died and sacrificed so that we may know peace and prosperity.

However, as I have said before, placing the lives of American soldiers at risk is something that should never be done lightly. They are the living embodiment of our collective desires and dreams for a better tomorrow. As the symbolic custodians of the public will, this body has an obligation to ensure that these young men and women are supported and that they are given the very best chance to successfully fulfill their mission. The Dayton Peace Accord does these things.

Mr. Speaker, Bosnia is a test. It is a test of our willingness to lead in an uncertain world. And, it is a test of our commitment to our NATO and Russian allies.

Some of my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, will argue that the conflict in Bosnia does not threaten our vital national security interests sufficiently enough to merit risking the lives of 25,000 American soldiers. But, I ask, who among us, Mr. Speaker, does not believe that the viability and vitality of NATO as an entity will be called into question if the United States fails to act now, at this crucial period in our history when Europe is experiencing its most brutal conflict since World War II? Who among us does not believe that our enemies will be emboldened to act in the face of American inaction and indecision? Who among us, Mr. Speaker, believes that the United States will be able to influence and coerce other nations to act when we ourselves are unwilling to commit our own sons and daughters?

Mr. Speaker, leadership requires much more than words—it demands action. Through American-led NATO airstrikes and consistent American diplomacy, the Presidents of Serbia, Bosnia and Croatia came to Dayton, OH, to pursue peace. It is that peace agreement that we must now act to enforce. History has taught us that in the absence of American leadership and involvement in Europe, aggressive regimes rise to threaten, not only the security of European neighbors, but our own vital national security interests. American inaction now, Mr. Speaker, will without doubt bring to an end the fragile peace that we are now witnessing blossom in Bosnia. Have we forgotten the horrible pictures of the malnourished and underclothed men waiting to die in the concentration camps spread across the remains of Yugoslavia? Have we forgotten the testimony of the thousands of women who were viciously raped or helplessly watched as their young sons, brothers, husbands, or fathers were dragged from their homes and villages never to be seen again? By doing nothing, Mr. Speaker, do we condemn these people to relive the horror of the past 4 years? Peace is at hand, Mr. Speaker, and leadership demands that we act to protect and foster it.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, Bosnia is a test. But, it is a test that we can and we must pass! The political and military objectives are clear. Unlike Vietnam, American troops will not be acting to militarily impose an American solution, but rather, they will be working in tandem with 40,000 Russian, British, French, German, and other European troops over a limited timeframe to enforce the terms of a negotiated peace—a peace that the Presidents of Bosnia, Serbia, and Croatia, have agreed upon. Neither, Mr. Speaker will our forces suffer the same fate as the United Nations Protection Force—left ineffective and ultimately irrelevant, unable to defend themselves let alone protect United Nations designated safe areas. Our forces and their European and Russian counterparts will have the military capability and authority to repel any threats to their security or violations of the Peace Agreement.

Further, Mr. Speaker, American troops will not be asked to mediate a centuries-old ethnic conflict, rather, we are intervening with our allies at the behest of the warring parties themselves, to conclude this most recent and bloodiest chapter of that conflict. Through our actions, we are giving the Bosnians, Serbs, and Croats time and space to nurture and foster peace. It is incumbent upon them to build upon this peace and shape a society in which different ethnicities and religious beliefs are seen as strengths and are embraced, rather than as weaknesses and rejected.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, let us not, in our rightful concentration on our own domestic problems, abrogate our global responsibilities and leadership. Let us not, Mr. Speaker, forget about the 250,000 Bosnians, Serbs, and Croats who have lost their lives in this bloody conflict and the countless others who have been wounded or have been forced to flee their homes because of ethnic cleansing. Let us not, in our desire to protect our brave sons and daughters, allow this war to spread beyond its current constraints and threaten Macedonia or Greece. Let us not, Mr. Speaker, forget about the lessons of history that have taught us to carefully guard ourselves against naive calls for isolationism. For we have learned, through the sweat and blood of our young men and women that freedom is not free and leadership requires more than words—it demands action.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the resolution offered by Mr. HAMILTON to express the support of Congress for the United States troops who will be deployed to Bosnia.

The deployment of U.S. troops is one of the most solemn and difficult decisions a country must make. Even when the mission is not to do battle but to preserve peace as is the case in Bosnia, the deployment of our Armed Forces involves inherent risk. No President and no Member of Congress could ever lightly consider the question of sending U.S. soldiers overseas in support of our national interests.

I would have preferred that the implementation of the Bosnian peace accord would not have required the deployment of U.S. troops. However, the President has made the commitment of our forces and, tonight, several hundred United States troops are in Bosnia and several thousand more are on their way. The choice for the House is whether to support those troops and the mission they seek to accomplish.

In my view, the Hamilton resolution is the only option before us that provides clear and unambiguous support for the brave American men and women who will be serving in Bosnia. While acknowledging that members of Congress continue to have concerns about the implementation of the Dayton Peace Accord, the Hamilton motion says that our soldiers deserve the unequivocal support of the U.S. Congress and the American people. Only the Hamilton motion sets aside the differences in policy that have brought us to this point and simply tells our troops that we support you and the job you are being called to do.

The actions of this House have real consequences for both our foreign policy and our troops who will serve in Bosnia. If we reject our proud tradition of bipartisanship in foreign relations, we will dishearten our friends and embolden our enemies. If, as some suggest, we say to U.S. troops that we support you as individuals but reject the job you are trying to do, it is an empty gesture. What's worse, an equivocating message from Congress that calls into question U.S. resolve threatens U.S. troops by encouraging isolated rogue elements who would resort to violence to derail the peace agreement.

I urge my colleagues to support the Hamilton resolution.

MODIFICATION TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 306 OFFERED BY MR. HAMILTON

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be modified by deleting the preamble and all of the text before the resolved clause, so that the resolution would simply read ''Resolved, that the House of Representatives unequivocally supports the men and women of the United States Armed Forces who are carrying out their mission in support of peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina with professional excellence, dedicated patriotism, and exemplary bravery.''

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. BAKER of California. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. On page 3 of the Buyer resolution, it says without any equivocation that the House of Representatives declares; Second, it is confident that the members of the U.S. Armed Forces, in whom it has the greatest pride and admiration, will perform their responsibilities with professional excellence, dedicated pratriotism, and exemplary courage.

Paragraph number 4 was written by the staff of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], and that has already been referred to earlier. We have covered this over and over.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAKER of California. Reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, there is nothing in the Buyer-Skelton resolution which specifically puts the Congress of the United States on record in support of the troops. The gentleman correctly points out that we express confidence in those trooops, and that is an important thing to do. In the clause mentioned by my friend, the gentlemen from New York [Mr. GILMAN], where he uses the word ''support'' a couple of times, that refers not to the Congress, but to the President and the Secretary of Defense ensuring that the commander of U.S. forces that are deployed in and around the republic, that they are furnished resources and support. That does not put the Congress on record in support.

My friends, I think this is an important matter. We have troops in the field. We have all kinds of differences in this body about the policy. They have been very well debated in this institution today. But I beg you, let us conclude on a unanimous note with a simple support of the troops. We will strip out all other language that raises quesions for Members on the other side.

Mr. BAKER of California. Mr. Speaker, respectfully reclaiming my time, both paragraph 4 which the gentleman read and which mentions ''support'' three times, on line 4, page 3, the House of Representatives declares that. Then it goes to four and says it supports, supports, supports.

I am very respectful of the gentleman's original resolution which states the following: ''Whereas the President has asked the people and the Congress of the United States to support the placement of United States Armed Forces on the ground,'' et cetera.

The gentleman rightfully struck that. That was the original intent of this resolution, sir, not thanking the troops. The Buyer resolution thanks the troops.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAKER of California. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to point out to my firend from Indiana, and this perhaps has already been pointed out, but line 20 on page 3 says the President and Secretary of Defense should rely on the judgment of the commander of the United States Armed Forces deployed in and around the territory of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina in all matters affecting the safety, support, and well-being of such members of the Armed Forces.

Then, four, the President and the Secretary of Defense should ensure the commander of the U.S. Armed Forces that are deployed in and around the territory of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina are furnished the resources and support that he needs to ensure the safety, support and well-being of such members of the Armed Forces.

Mr. BAKER of California. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the greatest way to support our troops would have been to keep them home. We lost that by five votes.

Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, does any Member of the House of Representatives who supports the troops in this matter have the right to seek modification, such that he or she could make a representation that they wish to request unanimous consent that we do exactly what the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] set forth?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would state that that is not a parliamentary inquiry.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow morning the first order of business be the Senate resolution sponsored by the majority leader, Mr. DOLE.

Mr. FRISA. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, the objector has to stand so we know who it is.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman who objected will please stand.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. FRISA] stood.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, point of order. The gentleman did not stand and object. He sat and objected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FRISA] objected.

Pursuant to section 4 of House Resolution 304, the previous question is ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 190, nays 237, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 858]

YEAS—190

Ackerman
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Berman
Bevill
Bishop
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Cardin
Castle
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Coyne
de la Garza
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Durbin
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gonzalez
Green
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Holden
Houghton
Hoyer
Jackson-Lee
Jefferson
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
King
Kleczka
Klink
LaFalce
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lincoln
Livingston
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McDermott
McHale
McIntosh
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Richardson
Rivers
Roemer
Rose
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sawyer
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sisisky
Skaggs
Slaughter
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Tanner
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Williams
Wilson
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NAYS—237

Abercrombie
Allard
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Browder
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bryant (TX)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cooley
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis
Deal
DeFazio
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle

Dornan	Jones	Rogers
Dreier	Kasich	Rohrabacher
Duncan	Kelly	Ros-Lehtinen
Dunn	Kim	Roth
Ehlers	Kingston	Roukema
Ehrlich	Klug	Royce
Emerson	Knollenberg	Salmon
English	Kolbe	Sanders
Ensign	LaHood	Sanford
Everett	Largent	Saxton
Ewing	Latham	Scarborough
Fawell	LaTourette	Schaefer
Fields (TX)	Laughlin	Schiff
Flanagan	Lazio	Seastrand
Foley	Leach	Sensenbrenner
Forbes	Lewis (CA)	Shadegg
Fowler	Lewis (KY)	Shaw
Fox	Lightfoot	Shays
Frank (MA)	Linder	Shuster
Franks (CT)	Lipinski	Skeen
Franks (NJ)	LoBiondo	Skelton
Frelinghuysen	Longley	Smith (MI)
Frisa	Lucas	Smith (NJ)
Funderburk	Manzullo	Smith (TX)
Gallegly	Martini	Smith (WA)
Ganske	McCollum	Solomon
Gekas	McCrery	Souder
Gilman	McDade	Spence
Goodlatte	McHugh	Stearns
Goodling	McKeon	Stockman
Gordon	Metcalf	Stump
Goss	Meyers	Talent
Graham	Mica	Tate
Greenwood	Miller (FL)	Tauzin
Gutknecht	Molinari	Taylor (MS)
Hancock	Montgomery	Taylor (NC)
Hansen	Moorhead	Thomas
Hastert	Myers	Thornberry
Hastings (WA)	Myrick	Tiahrt
Hayes	Neumann	Torkildsen
Hayworth	Norwood	Traficant
Hefley	Nussle	Upton
Heineman	Oxley	Vucanovich
Herger	Packard	Waldholtz
Hilleary	Parker	Walker
Hobson	Paxon	Walsh
Hoekstra	Petri	Wamp
Hoke	Pombo	Watts (OK)
Horn	Porter	Weldon (FL)
Hostettler	Portman	Weldon (PA)
Hunter	Pryce	Weller
Hutchinson	Quillen	White
Hyde	Quinn	Whitfield
Inglis	Radanovich	Wicker
Istook	Ramstad	Wise
Jacobs	Regula	Young (FL)
Johnson (CT)	Riggs	Zeliff
Johnson, Sam	Roberts	Zimmer

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Bateman

NOT VOTING—4

Gillmor	Tucker
McInnis	Young (AK)

So the resolution was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on resolutions concerning Bosnia considering this evening.

Mr. SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

OPPOSING THE NUCLEAR WASTE POLICY ACT OF 1995

(Mr. ENSIGN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to talk about House Resolution 1020, the nuclear waste issue for a deep repository and interim storage that will be located in Nevada. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1020 busts the Federal budget. I have a letter here from the gentleman from Ohio, JOHN KASICH, chairman of the Committee on the Budget, which says he will not give a budget waiver to this bill. The importance of that is because this bill does bust the Federal budget by over $4 billion in the next 7 years.

This bill has many other things that are wrong with it, but right now we are waging the biggest budget debate in anybody's recent memory on the budget in the United States. This would be a totally inappropriate time to go busting the budget by an additional $4 billion when we are trying to balance the Federal budget in the next 7 years.

Mr. Speaker, I must oppose severely, for the people of the State of Nevada, this bill which will target Yucca Mountain and nuclear waste in Nevada.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the letter from the chairman of the Committee on the Budget.

COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,
December 8, 1995.

Hon. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON,
Chairman, Committee on Rules,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to you regarding H.R. 1020, the ''Integrated Spent Nuclear Fuel Management Act of 1995''. In its present form the bill violates the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and could trigger automatic cuts in key entitlement programs under pay-as-you-go (PAYGO) requirements.

As you are probably aware, H.R. 1020 is designed to establish an interim nuclear waste storage facility at Yucca Mountain, Nevada as well as set up procedures for the eventual development of a permanent high-level radoactive waste storage site. I am concerned with Section 401(a)(2) of the bill that replaces the current mandatory fee paid by electric utilities for nuclear waste disposal with a discretionary fee that could vary subject to the level of appropriations provided for the program.

As currently written, the bill violates Section 311(a) of the Budget Act by providing new budget authority rules in excess of the levels set forth in the conference report accompanying H. Con. Res. 67. This bill, in the absence of further legislative action, would increase budget authority by $585 million in fiscal year 1996 and approximately $3.0 billion over the five year period from fiscal year 1996 through 2000.

By changing the nuclear waste disposal fee from mandatory to discretionary, a PAYGO (Section 252 of the Deficit Control Act of 1985) issue arises. The nuclear waste disposal fee change results in approximately $600 million per year in foregone offsetting receipts, a loss of $4.2 billion over the period from fiscal year 1996 through 2002. Absent other legislation, this could trigger a sequester of critical mandatory spending programs.

Furthermore, unless the discretionary spending caps are reduced, this legislation could increase the amount that can be spent under the discretionary spending caps. Increased discretionary spending would lead to higher budget deficits. This would occur because the measure authorizes offsetting collections, and the income generated by these offsetting collections creates room under the discretionary spending caps as set forth in current law for increased spending.

During our negotiations with the Administration, we have emphasized the need to reduce spending in order to achieve a balanced budget. I am concerned that passage of this bill in its current form would send the wrong signal to the Administration.

Thank you for your consideration, and I look forward to working with you to solve the problems in this bill.

Sincerely,

JOHN R. KASICH,
Chairman.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the bill from the House (H.R. 2606) ''An Act to prohibit the use of funds appropriated to the Department of Defense from being used for the deployment on the ground of United States Armed Forces in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina as part of any peacekeeping operation, or as part of any implementation force, unless funds for such deployment are specifically appropriated by law'' did fail to pass the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S.J. Res. 44. Joint resolution concerning the Deployment of United States Armed Forces in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained for rollcall vote No. 844 on December 7, 1995, Pearl Harbor day, and consequently missed the vote on the conference report for VA–HUD appropriations. Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye.''

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 104th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 141 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 13, 1995 No. 198—Part II

Senate

EXPRESSING OPPOSITION OF CONGRESS TO PRESIDENT CLINTON'S PLANNED DEPLOYMENT OF GROUND FORCES TO BOSNIA

(Continued)

WHY I OPPOSE SENDING GROUND TROOPS TO BOSNIA

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, in recent weeks I have spent a great deal of time thinking about Bosnia. I have been to hearings and briefings. I have consulted with experts. I have had many discussions with my colleagues and my constituents. One month ago, I even went to Sarajevo and Tuzla myself to see the conditions our soldiers would face there.

Since my return, I have taken to the floor of the Senate many times, and used every public opportunity, to state my opposition to the President's imminent deployment of ground troops to Bosnia. In the days since the conclusion of the Proximity Peace Talks in Dayton, I have also spoken out against any conditional support of this deployment coming from the Congress. The decision to intervene on the ground in Bosnia is a bad idea, Mr. President, and while I will always support our soldiers wherever they are sent, I want no part of this decision.

My conviction that the administration's intention to put troops in harm's way in Bosnia is a huge mistake rests on three broad arguments. First, and above all, the conflict in Bosnia poses no real threat to vital American interests—simply put, there is nothing in Bosnia that Americans should die for. Second, the Dayton talks have produced a false peace that is inherently unstable and politically doomed. Finally, the implementation force [I-For] plan is self-contradictory and hopelessly optimistic, and will expose our soldiers to unreasonable risks even as they diligently pursue its unrealistic objectives.

WHAT INTERESTS ARE THREATENED?

The administration has repeatedly argued that two vital interests are at stake in the conflict in Bosnia. If we don't intervene now, they say, the war will widen to a point where it threatens all of Europe. If the U.S. does not lead NATO in intervention, they say, both the NATO alliance and U.S. leadership of it will be at risk.

The President is correct when he says that preserving security in Europe, and maintaining American leadership of NATO, are vital American interests. But it is one thing to refer to vital interests, and another to claim that they are really threatened by the conflict in Bosnia. I do not think they are. The administration asserts that the war in Bosnia will spread throughout Central Europe. But where is the evidence that this conflict threatens Bosnia's neighbors? Local countries like Italy, Hungary, and Austria do not seem concerned.

The President has often referred to previous European wars in this century. But comparing this war to either of the world wars—and likening those of us who oppose United States involvement in Bosnia to 1930's-style isolationists—is absurd. It shows a profound misunderstanding of history, and of the roots of those conflicts. World War I began in the Balkans because the world powers took sides in a Balkan war, not because they kept at a safe distance. What the Clinton administration is doing looks a lot more like taking sides. As for World War II, neither Serbia, Bosnia, nor Croatia are anything like Nazi Germany, in terms of ambition, population, industrial strength, military power, or anything else. They are focused on each other, not on external aggression.

The Balkan war has not spread in the past 4 years, and it shows no signs of spreading. So when the President states that stability in Europe is a vital American interest, he is right. But when he says that European security is threatened in Bosnia, he is wrong.

The only other vital interest the administration refers to is that of preserving our leadership of the NATO alliance. Mr. President, I believe in NATO. It has served us well, and because there are still potential threats to European security, we must enhance and even expand it. But right now, the American people are divided on the question of NATO's importance. Many wonder if the alliance has outlived its usefulness. How does the administration expect Americans to feel about NATO when we get bogged down in a NATO mission in Bosnia? They will view every body bag as one more reason to get out of the alliance once and for all. They will ask: ''This is why we are a part of NATO?'' And they will be much less willing to act when a real threat to Europe comes along. There are still real threats to Europe out there, Mr. President.

Dragging—or being dragged by—the alliance into a conflict for which it was not designed and for which it is not suited is not leadership. NATO still has a viable mission, but not one of intervening in a nasty Balkan civil war that poses no demonstrable threat to European security. Why should we risk the inevitable conflicts with our NATO partners that will result when we all start taking casualties in a place where no one really wanted to be in the first place?

And why, if this is so important to NATO, should Russia—whose unpredictable future is one of the principal reasons for NATO's continued existence—be included so completely? Why would we go out of our way to include Russian forces with our own, when their natural sympathies lie with the Serbs that we will be trying to disarm, the Serbs we were bombing just a few weeks ago? We have been told by the

● This ''bullet'' symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

administration that we would be even-handed in our actions in Bosnia, but I was told by an administration official not long ago that the Bosnians were our first priority. But Russia's first priority will certainly be the Serbs.

Not only will this forced alliance with Russia bring Russian troops into Central Europe for the first time since World War II; it will create the potential for misunderstandings and conflict with Russian forces that we have not seen since the Berlin Wall came down—all in the name of preserving European security.

Mr. President, I repeat—I support NATO. If and when this conflict truly threatens Greece and Turkey, or any of our other NATO allies, I will support action to contain it. But the administration proposes not to contain the conflict, but to jump right into the middle of it. If NATO is to become a rationale for America intervening in civil wars in states that are not even members of the alliance, then I say we should disband the alliance tomorrow.

WHAT KIND OF ''PEACE'' ARE WE TRYING TO IMPLEMENT?

Mr. President, in all the discussion of the implementation force, many people have lost sight of how shaky the agreement reached in Dayton is itself. Regardless of our interests in Bosnia, or our concern for the victims of the war there, the NATO force is being sent to Bosnia to implement what I believe is a fatally flawed agreement, one not likely to survive without the continued presence of large numbers of NATO troops. Let me quote at length from a study by John Hillen of The Heritage Foundation, dated November 30, 1995, and titled ''Questioning The Bosnia Peace Plan'':

Is a bifurcated Bosnian state a realistic and sustainable political entity? The Bosnian peace accord proposes a Bosnia-Herzegovina that has the appearance of a single state, but is in fact based on two very separate political entities—The Bosnian Muslim/Croat Federation and the Bosnian Serb Republic. In order for the central organs of Bosnia to actually function as intended, the two separate entities of Bosnia will have to show the most extraordinary goodwill and cooperation towards each other, qualities that have never before been in evidence in Bosnia.

Many experienced diplomats have expressed skepticism about the political viability of this Bosnian state and the realistic chances of its survival as a centrally governed and coherent nation. * * * Stephen Cambone of the Center for Strategic and International Studies noted that ''any agreement reached in 20 days over issues that have been fiercely fought over for more than four years is fraught with compromises and internal flaws.'' Helmut Sonnenfeldt of the Brookings Institution noted that the accord has ''a lot of loose ends'' and ''many ways in which it could unravel.'' In short, the accord is diplomatically enchanting but realistically impractical.

Much of this skepticism over the accord is rooted in the fact that the accord does not address fundamental issues of sovereignty and ethnic self-determination. Instead, it freezes those unresolved issues in place and offers up an elaborate power sharing agreement for a Bosnian central government. However, it will be difficult for a contrived central government to replace the bonds of loyalty, authority, and legitimacy that currently exist between Bosnian Croats and Croatia and Bosnian Serbs and Serbia. Those existing bonds are rooted in centuries of political, ethnic, and cultural identity and are sure to prove stronger than bonds to a hastily fabricated central government. * * *

If history is any guide, this agreement does not stand much chance of lasting. In Cyprus in 1964, international negotiators reached a similar agreement between Turkish and Greek Cypriots. Much like the Bosnian agreement, the doomed Cyprus accord attempted to replace bonds to the ''parent entities'' for both sides (Greece and Turkey) with an unworkable central executive and ethnically aligned parliamentary blocs. This ensured continued intractability except in the event of the most extraordinary goodwill. This structure never worked because it never addressed the fundamental fears and aspirations of the warring factions and was completely predicated on a diplomatic fantasy: the hopes for a degree of cooperation that had never been present in Cyprus. After 10 years of sporadic fighting and instability under this makeshift arrangement, Turkey invaded the island, partitioned Cyprus, and put an end to the ephemeral peace; an imposed peace that was never locally supported. UN peacekeepers have been in Cyprus for over 30 years.

The same pattern can be expected in Bosnia. How can an imposed peace that does not reflect political realities or the basic concerns of the warring factions hope to survive except by the continued enforcement of thousands of NATO and American troops? The hastily concluded Bosnian peace accord is, by necessity, a weak plan. The weakness is inherent because the accord does not address the fundamental issues that caused the parties to go to war in the first place. It is, at best, a cease-fire that can only work under the continued stewardship of 60,000 heavily armed NATO combat troops.

Mr. President, it is my view that, in addition to finding threats to vital interests in the Balkans where there are none, the President is putting U.S. prestige on the line to implement a peace plan that has very little chance of succeeding in the long run even if everything goes well for a year.

THE REAL RISKS TO AMERICAN TROOPS

Maybe the most troubling thing about the Administration's approach to the Balkans is its confidence that it will be able to control the conflict after it jumps in with both feet. The President speaks of a ''limited, focused'' mission; he tells us that we are ''not fighting a war.'' Then why are we sending more than 60,000 troops, reinforced with tanks, artillery, and airpower? What of this talk of ''overwhelming force'' and ''robust rules of engagement?'' Just what is ''overwhelming force'' when you are fighting against landmines? What are ''robust rules of engagement'' when you are fighting snipers —an airstrike on the village where you think the shot came from? Mr. President, I remind my colleagues that we had robust rules of engagement and overwhelming force in Vietnam, and they did not work in the end. I think that it is utter nonsense to apply these concepts to Bosnia.

Regardless of any paper agreement signed in Dayton, there are those in Bosnia for whom continued fighting is a better deal. There are those who are profiting from the war as bandits or on the black market. There are those who are used to getting their way with guns; for them this war is about money, not ethnicity; one NATO commander told me that they had found cases where Serbs were selling black market ammunition to Muslims! What about those who will be displaced from their homes by the Dayton agreement, who will not willingly leave? What about those who have been displaced—there are up to three million refugees in Bosnia-Herzegovina—for whom peace means ''going home,'' but who will not be allowed to return as the result of the agreement? What about fighters who are demobilized as a result of the treaty, but cannot find jobs because the economy has been ruined? And those who just miss the power of a rifle? While I was in Tuzla last month, the commanding general of UN Sector Northeast, General Haukland, told me that there will be criminality and gangsterism when troops are demobilized. Mr. President, what about those who have a score to settle after four years of brutal war? One thing is certain, Mr. President—there are a lot of people in Bosnia who may be tempted to shoot at Americans, regardless of our ''overwhelming force'' and ''robust rules of engagement.''

A LONG-TERM COMMITMENT

On October 17, 1995, Secretary of Defense Perry told the Senate Armed Services Committee: ''The U.S. has vital political, economic, and security interests in Europe. The war in Bosnia threatens those interests, and the U.S. vital security interest is served by stopping this war.'' At the same hearing, Secretary Perry states the administration's commitment to bringing our troops home in approximately one year.

But the Administration cannot have it both ways. President Clinton cannot say that our vital interests are threatened in Bosnia, and at the same time pledge that we will be out of Bosnia in about a year. If two vital interests—European security and the NATO alliance—are truly threatened in Bosnia, how can there be a one-year statute of limitations on our response? Since when are American vital interests only worth one year's commitment?

The Administration has also said that United States troops will leave Bosnia if the peace agreement is violated and conflict resumes. In short, their plan claims to be defending a vital interest, but promises that we will leave if enough people shoot at us, or when the 12-month clock runs out. But if conflict in Bosnia really threatens a vital U.S. interest, are they not committed to ending that conflict no matter what it takes, or how long it takes? Is that not what ''vital interest'' means? Mr. President, if the administration can tell us that IFOR will leave in about a year, no matter what, then there must not be much of a

threat or much of a vital interest. If there are vital interests at stake, the Administration should be honest and tell the American people that we are committed to Bosnia for the long haul.

If I were sending one of my sons to Bosnia, I would want to know that his life was being put on the line to accomplish something important, something worth doing at any cost, and something that the American people stood firmly behind. But at best, the Dayton plan and IFOR will bring a few months' respite to the people of Bosnia. When the war resumes after we leave, or if ''systemic violations'' force us out, then the hundreds, perhaps thousands, of Americans who died trying to impose a token peace in an artificial country will truly have been wasted.

Vital interests are the only thing we should ask our soldiers to die for. When U.S. vital interests at stake, the American people and our troops alike will tolerate things going badly for a while. They will stay the course. If there were vital interests at stake in Bosnia, the President would not be giving us all of these details about rules of engagement, exit strategies, and time limits—he would not have to.

Mr. President, administration officials in Washington seem to be the only people who think we can finish this operation in a year. Not one military or diplomatic person I spoke with on my trip, not a single U.S., NATO, or U.N. commander, thought that peace in Bosnia could be achieved in anything close to 12 months. Given the forbidding geography, harsh winter climate, and wholesale destruction in Bosnia, it will be months before even modest degree of stability could be restored, even if everyone cooperates fully. The UN commander in Tuzla, General Haukland of Norway, described a one-year presence as a hand in water—when you take it out, nothing has changed. In Balkan history, a year is no time at all.

The simple truth, Mr. President, is that the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina is about to become America's pet country. The United States of America is going to own Bosnia and all of her problems just as soon as the 1st Armored Division sets up in Tuzla. Does anyone really believe that we will leave Bosnia in a year if the threat to her stability remains? Does anyone really believe, after arming, training, and equipping the Bosnian Army for a year, that we will stand by and watch if our pet army is on the verge of defeat? Of course not; if Bosnia is as important as the Administration says it is, we will stay in Bosnia as long as we have to. We have already employed airstrikes against the Serbs; we will do so again if Bosnia is threatened again. I say to my colleagues—we are on the verge of what may be a very long commitment.

So Mr. President, I have said that I will resist this plan with all of my power, and I will do so down to the wire. I think the peace is false, the plan is naive, and the risk to our troops unrealistically high. There is only one way to express these conclusions: I urge my colleagues to oppose the Dole-McCain Resolution of conditional support, and to support the Hutchison–Inhofe Resolution opposing the deployment of ground troops to Bosnia.

Mr. President, I want to make a couple of observations about the debate that is taking place tonight. There seems to be a lot of people who are going to vote, perhaps, for the Hutchison–Inhofe resolution, then turn around and vote also for the Dole-McCain resolution. I suggest, Mr. President, that would be a little inconsistent.

After looking at a final copy—and we only received a copy of the Dole-McCain resolution a matter of a couple of hours ago in its final version—I cannot see that it narrows the mission at all. It starts off by saying, ''Before acting, pursuant to the resolution, the President shall make available to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate his determination. . .''—and then they cover a number of things that they want the President to certify. For example, the Dole-McCain resolution says: ''The mission will be limited to the implementation of the military provisions of the Dayton agreement.''

But the administration has already, in effect, certified this: Secretary Christopher said, on December 1: ''Let me assure you that IFOR's mission is well-defined and limited. Our troops will enforce the military aspects of the agreement. They will not be asked to guarantee the success of democracy or reconstruction.''

Secretary Perry said the same thing: ''The mission of IFOR is to oversee and enforce the implementation of the military aspects of the peace agreement.'' That is exactly the same as we find in the Dole-McCain amendment.

Second, Dole-McCain says: ''An integral part of the successful accomplishment of the objective is the establishment of military balance.'' This is what the administration has been saying all along. For example, Secretary Christopher has said: ''We are committed to achieve the stable military balance with Bosnia and among the states of the former Yugoslavia.''

In another part of the Dole-McCain resolution, it says: ''The United States will lead an immediate international effort to provide equipment, arms, training, and related logistics assistance of the highest possible quality to ensure that the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina can provide for its own defense.''

Again, on December 1, Secretary Christopher said: ''The Armed Forces in the Federation will need to obtain some equipment and training in order to establish an effective self-defense capability. As for our part, the United States will ensure that the Federation Armed Forces receive the necessary assistance.''

What I am saying, Mr. President, is I think it is inconsistent for someone to vote for Hutchison–Inhofe and turn around and vote for Dole-McCain. Dole-McCain simply requires the President to say what he has been saying all along. Is that supposed to narrow the mission? Is that supposed to reassure us?

Second, Mr. President, I was listening very attentively to the very knowledgeable and scholarly Senator from West Virginia, Senator BYRD, talking about the constitutional rights of the President and the responsibilities of the President and also the constitutional rights of Congress. I thought, all the way through, that he was coming to the conclusion that the President cannot do what he has already done. At least that is what I was inferring from his remarks. But I gather he will support the President by voting for Dole-McCain.

I did hear several other valuable arguments during the course of the day. Senator FEINGOLD came out with some very strong constitutional arguments that would lead one to believe that the President has indeed overstepped his powers. He referred to an article by Louis Fisher, which I later made a part of this RECORD. He says: ''The framers knew that the British King could use military force against other countries without legislative involvement. They gave to Congress the responsibility for deciding matters of war and peace. The President, as Commander in Chief, was left with the power to repel sudden attacks.''

So that qualifies what the President is able to do within his constitutional rights. We made that a part of the RECORD. In sitting and listening to the debate today—and I stayed in the Chamber the entire day, as I feel this is the most critical vote we will have, probably, at least in the last year or 2, and I wanted to hear everyone's viewpoint. I think the distinguished Senator from Alabama, Senator HEFLIN, talked at some length about how this should be a European mission. I have said over and over again that maybe we have a responsibility—and I am not going to debate that because everybody is assuming that we have a responsibility to protect the integrity of NATO, to respond in some way to the atrocities that have taken place. I have suggested that there are atrocities taking place all over the world. Where do you draw the line? Do you draw it here? Or are we, in fact, doing this because the President, in February 1993, made a statement that he was going to send ground troops in?

But the Senator from Alabama, Senator HEFLIN, talked about the fact that this should be a European mission. Nobody will deny that it is more a responsibility of Europe than it is the United States. Yet, we talk about the contribution that our NATO partners are making to this.

Germany, who is in the backyard of the Balkans, is sending a total of 4,000 troops, and they debated it in their legislative body before agreeing to do that. We did not have time to debate it before we did it. Yet, we are talking about sending five times the troops that Germany is sending.

I listened very carefully while several people on the floor made points. I want to briefly respond to a couple of them. First of all, as far as our troops being supported, I think we all have made it abundantly clear that we in this body, as well as the other body, are supporting our troops, not just here, but all around the world. What greater support could there be for our troops than by not sending them into this hostile area to start with? That is real support of the troops.

That is what we are trying to do with the Hutchison–Inhofe resolution—make it abundantly clear that our troops should not have to be over there. When they are over there—if, in fact, they end up in a mass deployment—yes, we will support our troops all the way. I think that has been said over and over again. I do not think anybody is going to deny that.

The Senator from New Mexico, Senator DOMENICI, made a very good point. What we are trying to do is state our opposition to this before it gets started.

You see, the troops are not deployed yet. Yes, there are some there. We will support those. Those are the advance troops, logistic troops, but the mass deployment that the President has promised immediately after the signing of this agreement in Paris has not yet taken place. So this debate is taking place now, before the mass deployment has taken place.

The junior Senator from California commented in her remarks that this deployment was acceptable ''as long as it remains a peacekeeping mission.'' I suggest to the junior Senator from California it is not a peacekeeping mission now. We keep hearing about peacekeeping as if there is currently peace to keep. There is a cease-fire in effect. But I have been in parts of Bosnia during this cease-fire when the gunfire was going off; in some parts of the northeast sector, near Tuzla, they do not even know there is a cease-fire. The title that we are giving ourselves now, giving to I-FoR, is ''peace implementation.'' There is a big difference between peacekeeping and peace implementation. Peace implementation means we do not have peace now but we will implement it. That is a totally different mission.

Mission creep has already crept into this, Mr. President. The exit strategy seems to be to keep peace for a year, and then leave. As the junior Senator from California said, all we have to do is keep peace for a year and we are out of there. She is saying exactly what Secretary Christopher said, exactly what General Shalikashvili said as recently as last week before the Senate Armed Services Committee, saying it is inconceivable we will not be out of there in a year.

During my visit with the Norwegian general who commands the U.N.'s northeast sector, in the Tuzla area, I mentioned ''12 months,'' he smiled and said, ''You mean 12 years.'' And when we talked about 12 months he said, ''Apparently the American people do not understand the way the people in that region think, the Serbs, the Croats, and the Moslems. Their conception of time is totally different.'' He used an analogy I have used on the floor. It is like putting your hand in water for 12 months, you look and take your hand out and nothing has happened. When we leave the war will start again. If they know we will be gone in a year, which we have said we will be—the President has reaffirmed that as recently as last week, and it was reaffirmed a week ago by Secretary of Defense Perry—what will they do? Lay low for a year and then come back out swinging. By the way, Mr. President, the combatants in this conflict have a habit of laying low every winter.

I do not think I have ever in my life—and I did serve in the Armed Forces—I do not ever remember a time in our Nation's history or in the history of warfare where we went into a hostile area and then our exit strategy was geared to time, instead of being geared to events. But that is exactly what we are proposing to do here.

The senior Senator from California was talking about ''A far greater risk in doing nothing than in sending our troops.'' I suggest that it is not quite that easy. It would be easy if we were able to pass the Hutchison–Inhofe resolution and the President would look at this and say clearly we do not have Congress behind sending ground troops in but we have a responsibility to NATO, we have a responsibility to Bosnia. If he felt that way he could do it and we could do it through air power. We have already been there with airstrikes. We know that works. We could lift the arms embargo.

Sure, our European partners do not want us to do that. They want us on the ground there. People talk about how well received our President was over in Europe. I think if I lived in Europe I would be receiving him well, too. He is coming over and proposing that we fight their battle for them. I suggest that there are other alternatives.

Senator ASHCROFT from Missouri was talking about the speech that the President made in 1993 and suggested something I had not thought about. Maybe the President made the commitment of United States ground troops back in February 1993 without having been really apprised of the situation in Bosnia, the deep hostility, the history of that area, the history of World War I, World War II, the 500-year-old civil war, and what has been going on over there for many years.

The Senator from Delaware, Senator BIDEN, was articulate and outspoken when he talked about the different parties there. I think he referred to Milosevic as someone who was perhaps a war criminal, and certainly he talked about the others who had actually been indicted for war crimes. Lastly, it was Senator KOHL who said that we either support peace or we do not. I think there are many ways where we can offer our support without doing it on the ground. I will mention one other thing that the Senator from North Carolina mentioned when he talked about the fact that the bridges and the roads in that sector—from Hungary down south through Tuzla, down toward Sarajevo, in the area that goes from the Posavina corridor down to Tuzla—that the roads would not accommodate an M–1 tank. We found out when we were over there that there is only one bridge in that entire area that they say can handle it structurally. The Americans will have to come in and rebuild the bridges, rebuild the roads, and if they do not they will start a civil war because the people are upset for us coming in and messing up the existing roads with our tanks. This came from the people now in command, the U.N. people in the northeast sector.

The most profound thing I have heard on the floor of the Senate today came from the very distinguished Senator from Indiana, Senator COATS. He asked the question, ''Have we so squandered American leadership that we must buy it back with American lives?'' I think this puts it in perspective. If we are wanting to prove to someone that we have this leadership, that we must lead and whatever NATO decides to do is in the best interest of the allies and that we must blindly go along with them, do we do this at the risk of lives?

On October 17 we asked the question of Secretary Christopher and Secretary Perry. This was after Gen. Michael Rose made the statement if the Americans get into this war they will sustain more losses than they did during the Persian Gulf war, where we lost a total of 390 lives.

I asked the question, is your mission here worth 400 or more lives? Secretary Christopher said yes; Secretary Perry said yes; General Shalikashvili said yes. I think that is a defining difference between the administration's view and my own.

I think that we need to at least acknowledge this body is already on record opposing what President Clinton is about to do. So it is not a matter of waiting until the last minute, until the last hour. Over a month ago we passed a sense-of-the-Congress amendment in both the House and Senate, attached to the Defense appropriations bill by Senator GREGG: ''It is the sense of Congress that none of the funds available for the Department of Defense should be obligated or exploited for the deployment or participation of the United States Armed Forces in any peacekeeping operation in Bosnia-Herzegovina * * *.''

This opposition is not something we are coming up with today for the first time. The Senate is already on record.

Lastly, let me go over some of the things that were talked about on the floor today in terms of danger. I think we are kind of trying to soften this thing, trying to gloss over the dangers. Some say we will go over and everyone will be kissing the American flag and everyone will love us because we brought peace into the Balkans. If you stop and look, and this came out of the Defense News, of the various elements over there, the Croats have 80,000 soldiers; the Croatian Serbs 50,000; Serbia, 125,000; Bosnia, 110,000; Bosnian Serbs, 80,000; Bosnian Croats, 50,000. That is not even talking about the rogue elements, and there are some nine rogue elements that are over there.

It is so convoluted it reminds me of the letter that came back from one of our warriors who lost his life in Somalia. It was the son of Captain James Smith, who read me the letter of his son. His son was Cpl. Jim Smith who lost his life. Capt. Jim Smith lost his leg in Vietnam and his son lost his life in Somalia. His was one of those corpses dragged through the street in Mogadishu. His last letter said: Dad, we cannot tell who our friends are and who they are not. We cannot tell the difference.

I suggest that is exactly the situation that we have here. Many people have talked about the fact that we are going to have just 20,000 or 25,000 troops over there. I hope no one is kidding themselves, deluding themselves thinking that is all we are going to have.

There was an article in the Defense News that gave a very persuasive argument that we would end up with a total NATO force of 240,000 troops. Keeping our ratio, that would be 80,000 Americans who will be involved over there.

Go back and read your history. British Prime Minister Disraeli, over 100 years ago, who had been observing the battles over there, said, ''It will take a half-million troops to bring peace to the Balkans.''

I think, when we look at the timeframe of 12 months—that is fictitious. It is not going to happen. The 20,000 troops, that is not going to happen. The mission is peacekeeping—that already is not happening, it is now peace implementation. We are kidding ourselves.

We have already had a vote on H.R. 2606. That was a very strong vote, even though there were just 22 who voted in favor of it. Those are the people who really feel the strongest about not sending troops into that area. But we are going to have another record vote. That record vote is going to take place this evening.

We are going to have two record votes. When you have the first vote on the Hutchison–Inhofe resolution, think very carefully. Because if you vote for that, as I said when I opened these remarks, you cannot turn around and vote for the Dole-McCain resolution because they are inconsistent with each other. This is the last opportunity that the Senators who are here and will be voting tonight will have to get on record. This is their last shot, the last chance they have to say no, we should not send ground troops into Bosnia.

I do not think it is possible for anyone to understand the hostility of the area if he or she has not been up there to Tuzla where our troops will go. To the best of my knowledge, only two Members of Congress have been up there, Senator HANK BROWN from Colorado and myself. When we had a meeting the other day in the Senate Armed Services Committee, I discovered that even Secretary Perry had not been up there, Secretary Christopher had not been up there, General Shalikashvili had not been up there, and certainly President Clinton has not been up there.

I cannot imagine that they would be willing to take chances in a hostile area without going up and looking at it. I can tell you firsthand, and I went over much of that area in a helicopter not more than 100 feet off the treetops with Gen. Rupert Smith, a British general. We looked down and for the first time we could realize how Marshal Tito was able to hold off the very best that Hitler had on a ratio of 1 to 8, because of the unique environment, the very hostile and forbidding environment.

Mr. President, this is going to be probably the most significant vote that many Members of this body will cast. It is going to be tonight. I would like to have them think long and hard. Because if you vote for—if you vote against the Hutchison–Inhofe resolution and vote for the Dole-McCain resolution, you are saying we agree with the basic policy of sending ground troops.

You see, I think everybody knows now, we can support our troops and not support the policy. That is an easy thing to do. We all support our troops. The greatest support we could give our troops is to not to deploy them into that warring area.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order the Senator from Minnesota is recognized for 7 minutes.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, 4 years of mass executions, mass rape, mass murders, brutal ethnic cleansing, sieges against civilians, terror campaigns, atrocities, and genocide not seen in Europe since the end of World War II—¼-million people dead, 3 million people in the region refugees, and if we were to think about this in terms of our population, that would be the equivalent of 170 million American refugees.

The people of Bosnia deserve relief from years of armed conflict, relief from displacement, relief from malnutrition and hunger, relief from winters without heat or electricity, relief from war crimes and, yes, relief from the indifference of the rest of the world.

I traveled to the former Yugoslavia by myself 2 years ago. I went with my legislative assistant, Colin McGinnis. I visited with people in the refugee camps, and I saw enough pain and enough misery to last me for a lifetime. The Dayton agreement is the best and perhaps it is the last chance for peace in the region. That is why I intend to support it.

While I am speaking on the floor, I would like to express my thanks and my love to the family of three American diplomats killed in Bosnia while serving the cause of peace.

Our proper constitutional role as Senators and Representatives is to not give broad grants of authority to any President. I have talked to experts outside the Congress, had many briefings from people in the administration, met with people in the former Yugoslavia, and I have tried to the best of my ability to make the best decision for my country and for the world that I live in. I believe it is our responsibility to make sure the objectives are limited. I believe it is our responsibility to insist on as much clarity as possible.

There are several reserve units going from Minnesota, and, as a Senator, I owe those families. It is my responsibility to make sure that everything is done that can be done to preserve their safety and the safety of all of our soldiers who are there—not to go to war, as I listen to the Senator from Oklahoma, but are there to secure a peace.

Do I have concerns? You bet I have concerns. I do not think the arms control provisions of this agreement are very strong. I worry about the international police provisions; I think they are weak. I believe that there should have been, in the Dayton agreement, really a clear understanding—we keep talking about this 1-year time agreement—that the Europeans are a part of the transition and that they assume the responsibility for peacekeeping so that when we leave after a year or thereabouts, in fact the presence of NATO is there. Because it is not clear to me that we will be able to accomplish our objectives in that period of time.

Do I worry? You bet I worry. I have been up at night trying to decide what the right decision would be. I worry about the landmines. I have had briefings from our military, and there are reasons for all of us to worry. Our soldiers are trained, they have been doing the training in Germany, but I worry about that. I worry about depending on Milosevic. I think Milosevic is a war criminal. And when I hear Milosevic has made this commitment and that commitment, it makes me nervous.

I wonder what the meaning is when General Mladic says he has not agreed to this agreement. Does he go to the hills with his soldiers? I worry about that as well.

This has been a difficult decision for me, but in the end I really believe that we are doing the right thing as a nation. In the end, I think the alternative

to no peacekeeping force there—and there will be no peacekeeping force and there will be no agreement if we are not a part of that force—will be a living hell. The alternative, I say to my colleagues, will be a living hell: More genocide, more rape, more murder, more mass executions in Bosnia. And it could be a war that spreads to Central Europe.

We are there to do the right thing. I believe that. I believe that for our children. I believe that for my children.

In the end, I stand on the side of hope, hope for an end to this conflict, hope for an end to its attendant horrors, hope for a better world that we live in, hope for the peoples of that region, hope for an end to the bitter ethnic divisions, hope for an end to the religious hatred.

I believe that we, therefore, in casting this vote in supporting our soldiers and in supporting this peacekeeping mission—I believe we cast the right vote. That is why I will vote for the Dole-McCain resolution, and that is why I am in opposition to the Inhofe-Hutchison resolution.

Mr. President, on the day before the formal signing of the Paris Peace Agreement on Bosnia, we are gathered here for a historic debate. I want to share with my colleagues my views on the deployment of United States peacekeepers to Bosnia to participate in the NATO peacekeeping mission there.

Designed to help put an end to the violence that has cost so many lives and so much suffering over the last 4 years, it offers real hope for peace. After much thought, I have come to a simple conclusion. With U.S. participation in the NATO peace effort, there is a real chance for a durable peace that could break the brutal cycle of violence there. Without our participation, we face an almost certain resumption of the fighting, and possibly a wider Balkan war.

This war has taken a horrible toll, not only on the people of the region, but also on the conscience of people everywhere who have watched it unfold in all its horror on their TV screens, and struggled to figure out a way to help end it.

For 4 years the people of Bosnia have suffered some of the worst atrocities in Europe: mass executions, mass rapes, brutal ethnic cleansing, sieges against innocent civilian populations, and terror campaigns. Atrocities we have not seen since the end of WW II.

So far, the war there has left a quarter of a million dead, and nearly 3 million people from the region refugees, expelled from their homes and villages in brutal campaigns of ethnic cleansing. Three million refugees. Think of that. If such a war were fought here in the United States, by population share that would be equal to about 170 million American refugees.

The people of Bosnia deserve immediate relief from the years of armed conflict, displacement, malnutrition and hunger, winters without heat or electricity, war crimes, and at times indifference by the rest of the world. The Dayton agreement offers a promise of such relief. I visited the Balkans 2 years ago. I met many people there, including many refugees who had been expelled from their homes, and who had lost loved ones and friends. I know the trials and horror they have experienced.

Even in the face of these horrors, the President's decision to send United States troops to Bosnia is one of the most difficult foreign policy choices our country has confronted since the end of the cold war. The risks of the deployment, though I think they have been greatly reduced by the administration's careful planning, are real. From the millions of landmines left over from the war, to irregular forces, to weather, to other hazards, this mission is not without its dangers.

But while many of us have had differing views about the proper United States role in Bosnia over the past 4 years, and some of us had pressed for tougher action against the Serbs for many months, there is one thing that is becoming more and more clear. The Dayton agreement is the best, and perhaps the last, chance for peace in the region. That's why I intend to support it.

Full and effective implementation of this agreement offers the best hope to stop this brutal war, and to give the parties a chance to recover, and to rebuild their cities, to rebuild their nations. After months of fruitful negotiations led by the United States, and with the Europeans providing the bulk of peacekeeping forces to help monitor the agreement, I believe it would be a mistake for the U.S. Congress to sound an uncertain, quavering trumpet now regarding our commitment to peace in the region.

Through tough-minded, tenacious diplomacy, President Clinton's envoy Richard Holbrooke worked for many months to help the warring parties craft an agreement that could bring an end to the bloodshed. He deserves our praise, and our thanks—as do those three American diplomats killed in Bosnia while serving the cause of peace.

President Clinton observed in his recent speech that the United States can't be the world's policeman, but we can become involved in circumstances such as this, where we have a compelling national interest in maintaining the peace, where we have a chance to be effective, and where we have a clear duty to help.

Over the course of the last few weeks, I have talked with the President and with his chief foreign policy advisors, including Secretary of State Christopher and Secretary of Defense Perry, and pressed them to ensure our mission was clear, limited, and governed by strict rule of engagement that would allow our troops to protect themselves in any circumstances. The Dayton Agreement provides for sweeping NATO rules of engagement that will allow U.S. forces to use all appropriate force to protect themselves. In the last 2 weeks, I have been urging administration officials to clarify the limited, narrow goals of the mission; how they intend to measure progress toward those goals, and the limits they will impose on U.S. troop activity in the region. I believe they have made real progress in clarifying each of these areas.

This is our proper role in Congress: to press administration officials to clarify key points of their plan, ensure that objectives are limited and attainable, that an exit strategy is clearly laid out, and that planning for a post-U.S. presence upon withdrawal, composed presumably of Europeans, is moving forward. I believe that we have done that, pressing those responsible in the administration to close some gaps in their thinking that will serve our troops well in the long run.

I have thought long and hard about this deployment and, in addition to my discussions with the President and his senior advisors, have consulted extensively with those whom I represent in Minnesota, administration officials at the working level in the Pentagon, the State Department, and elsewhere. I have talked with outside regional experts, and others. I've talked with Minnesota military personnel who are being deployed to Europe. There are several reserve units from Minnesota whose members are being deployed to Europe, and I am aware of my direct and profound responsibilities to them and to their families—and to the families of all our troops—to ensure that everything possible is done to preserve their safety.

The Dayton Agreement, especially its key military annexes, were clearly designed with these concerns in mind. And it has garnered broad support. It has the support of the Russians, of the U.N. Security Council, NATO, the European Union, and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, each of whom will play a key role in its implementation. It is truly a multilateral effort, of which the administration should be proud.

But even though we played a key role in the development of this agreement among the parties, let us not forget one critical thing; this is their agreement, not ours. It was developed by the parties, not imposed by outsiders. They have asked other nations, including the United States, to help secure the future of that agreement.

And they have assured us, NATO, and the U.N. Security Council that they will respect its terms, and take steps to protect our peacekeeping forces. Over 25 nations have responded to the call to help secure this peace. As the last remaining superpower, we have an obligation to join them. If the current ceasefire holds, and the peace agreement is signed tomorrow in Paris and begins to be implemented on schedule in the next few weeks, we have a duty, I believe, to help.

I think it would be irresponsible to sit aside and allow the horrors that have taken place in Bosnia to continue. Our great hope is that this peace agreement might finally secure a lasting peace; we must not abandon that hope now by cutting off funds for our troops, or by refusing to grant at least conditional support for the mission.

I have decided to support this peacekeeping deployment, even though I am fully aware of the potential risks and problems with it. For example, I believe the arms control and international police provisions of the Dayton Agreement are weak, and must be strengthened. And they are being strengthened and fleshed out, by NATO planners and through proposals offered last weekend at the London Implementing Conference. In the end, how they are implemented will make the big difference, and we in Congress must monitor this carefully. The reporting requirements of the Dole-McCain resolution will help ensure that Congress is kept informed on a formal, timely basis of developments in key areas of the accord's implementation, in both its military and civilian aspects.

Likewise, I remain somewhat concerned that the very broad NATO rules of engagement leave considerable room for interpretation on the part of NATO field commanders there about how to react when faced with violent civil disturbances, hostage situations, harassment by irregular forces, or other similar situations. I know they do so to provide flexibility to our commanders in the field, but this is another area which must be monitored carefully. Supervising the separation of forces, maintained by the parties, is one thing. But serving as local police forces is quite another. While I know the Dayton Agreement prohibits the latter, we must be careful to ensure that the potential for any mission creep is strictly limited.

We have heard a lot of heartfelt debate today, and expressions of concern about the potential for an extended, open-ended deployment. To those who are worried that Bosnia could turn out to be a quagmire, I can only say I have consulted as broadly as I could, weighted the risks as responsibly as I could, and I do not believe that is going to happen. I believe the administration has built into its implementation plans sufficient safeguards to avoid this problem, including strict limits on the areas where our troops will be, and on their mission. If I did believe this was a real risk, I would fiercely oppose this deployment. Let there be no mistake. This will be a NATO operation, with clear lines of command and rules of engagement, run by an American general. The mission is not open-ended. Our troops will be heavily armed, with the power and authority to respond to any potential threats as forcefully as necessary.

Of course, there are some concerns that can never be fully met. For example, I have doubts about the sincerity of Serb President Milosevic, and about his ability to deliver on his promises. I have even less confidence in the Bosnian Serbs. I am frankly alarmed that General Mladic has not been willing to support the agreement, that Serb civilians in the Sarajevo suburbs have been so vocal in opposing it, and that the Bosnians have resisted cutting their ties with radical states like Iran. But those doubts should not deter us from at least supporting this attempt at peace; they simply offer reasons for caution.

I have raised some of these concerns explicitly with the President and his advisors. I have asked tough questions of administration officials about how they intend to make good on United States commitments to lead an effort to provide arms and training to the Bosnian Government while serving as neutral peacekeepers. While I have in the past supported lifting the arms embargo against the Bosnians, I believe that with this agreement there is a real chance to stablize the situation through arms control, rather than primarily through building up the opposing armies.

That's where our emphasis should be now. Demilitarization on all sides, not remilitarization, is the appropriate course to follow to estalish a military balance between the Serbs and the Moslem-Croat Federation. Once a full NATO balance-of-forces assessment is complete, the report required by the Dole resolution is submitted to Congress, and the arms build-down begins in earnest, I am hopeful that full compliance with the arms control provisions of the peace agreement will go a long way toward equalizing the forces. And if it does not complete the task, there will be plenty of moderate Moslem nations willing to help arm, equip, and train the Bosnians to better defend themselves, as necessary.

I have also raised questions about the criteria that will be applied by NATO to measure progress toward its goals, and about the timetable for the eventual withdrawal of U.S. forces. Administration officials have provided me with all the information they could on these questions. While many of us would like to know that our troops will come home by next Christmas, I do not think the administration can realistically provide firm assurances that that will happen, and I think that it would be foolish to demand them as a condition for our support, since it could place our troops in great jeopardy if they are pulled our prematurely.

I do know the President intends to have us get in, complete our mission, and get out, as swiftly as possible, and that General Shalikashvili has indicated that 1 year is more than sufficient time to accomplish the limited military goals of the mission. Completing our mission should be our primary goal, not meeting some arbitrary timetable that may by driven more by domestic politics than by the situation on the ground in Bosnia.

Whether 1 year is also sufficient time to secure other, broader goals, including return of refugees, free and fair elections, and rebuilding of war-torn Bosnia, is unlikely. I know of almost no one who believes it is possible in that timeframe. But at least this yearlong respite can end the violence, and start them on the road toward peace. I hope that we will be able to work out an agreement with out allies that will provide for a much smaller, residual force that could stay there longer, if needed, to monitor compliance with the accord. Composed largely of NATO troops from Europe, this force could begin to shoulder primary responsibility for the mission after 9 to 10 months. I have urged the administration to explore this more vigorously, because I think it is key to our exit strategy in the region. I would have preferred that it be built into this resolution. But I am satisfied that the administration has taken seriously this concern, and will take steps to explore it with our allies.

On these and many other questions, administration officials have been very forthcoming. Where they were unable to provide clear answers, for example on the planned composition of a follow-on force if such a force were necessary after U.S. withdrawal, they outlined for me the state of their current thinking. Frankly, there is still much work to be done by NATO, the U.N. Security Council, and others over the course of the next few weeks and months to nail down answers to some of these key questions. But overall, I am satisfied that this deployment has been carefully planned and will be executed ably by our military forces. It is the responsible thing to do, the right thing to do. And that's why I intend to support it.

Many Americans remain skeptical of U.S. participation in this peacekeeping effort. I continue to believe it is critical that the President have the support of the American people and their representatives in Congress before moving forward. And I think that as this process has moved forward, and the President and his advisors have made clear the limited, narrow nature of the NATO mission, more Americans are being persuaded that this peacekeeping effort is the right thing to do.

Whatever we decide today, the President has already started sending U.S. troops to serve as advance support for the U.S. mission there. We must support the troops, and their families here in the United States, in every way we can. This resolution expresses clearly our support for their efforts.

Mr. President, this has been a difficult decision for me. But in the end I stand on the side of hope—hope for an end to the conflict and its attendant horrors, hope for a better future for the peoples of that region, hope for an end to the bitter ethnic and religious hatreds that have engulfed the region. It is a hope tempered by realism, though, about the road that lies ahead, and the potential pitfalls of this agreement.

Finally, let me say this. Over the last few weeks, some have asked me why I would be willing to consider supporting this peacekeeping deployment, when I opposed our going to war in the Persian Gulf. There a host of major differences between the two situations, not least of which is that our troops were being sent to the Persian Gulf to go to war; in Bosnia, they are going to secure a peace. The have been invited by the parties in Bosnia to secure a peace agreement, under firm security assurances provided by the parties. I opposed the war in the gulf, among other reasons, because—like Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Colin Powell—I believed the tough U.N.-imposed sanctions ought to have been given more time to bite. In Bosnia, I do not believe that are realistic alternatives to this peacekeeping deployment that have gone untried.

This may be the opportunity that is needed, Mr. President, to break the cycle of violence in the lands of the former Yugoslavia by helping to keep the sides apart for a year in order to give them some time to begin putting their lives back together. Hopefully a year of peace will bring about something more lasting. It is my hope for the future of the peoples of that region that has led to me to conclude that we should support the President's action. I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this resolution.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from North Carolina is recognized.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, as a cosponsor of the Hutchison–Inhofe resolution opposing President Clinton sending American troops to Bosnia, I am obliged to note that the administration's problem is that it lacks a coherent policy for resolving the war in the former Yugoslavia. That is it, pure and simple.

A coherent policy must be based upon a clear-eyed assessment of the United States national interest in the Balkans. It must employ a means to address our national interest, calculated in direct proportion to the threat posed to the United States. Most of all, a coherent policy must have an end, a goal, a point at which we can define when the mission is accomplished.

The administration's plan has none of these elements.

The foundation of President Clinton's policy in Bosnia is not the national interest—it is desperation. This desperation to fill the vacuum of American leadership in Bosnia has led the President to make a disastrous decision. In a last, desperate act he is demanding that the U.S. military rescue his foreign policy.

The American people should be prepared for the possibility that American lives will be lost any time our national interest is at stake. I am certain that if asked to go to war our brave men and women in uniform would, without hesitation, heed the President's call. I salute those who would serve the Nation so readily, but I cannot and will not support the President's decision to ask them to make this sacrifice. The risk to the lives of our troops far exceeds any national interest the United States could possibly have—particularly as defined by President Clinton—any national interest we could possibly have in the Balkans.

The question will not go away: ''Mr. President, what precisely is your goal? What is your objective in Bosnia? Is it the creation of an inviolable Bosnian nation?'' If so, the Dayton Agreement assuredly does not accomplish that goal. The agreement—pure and simple—is the partitioning of a sovereign nation on ethnic lines.

Is Mr. Clinton's goal to provide the people of Bosnia the means of defending themselves? If so, the President has so far shown no inclination to do so. Is it to save his own foreign policy and salvage his administration's standing on the world stage? If so, it is too late, and a disastrous military campaign in the Balkans can only do harm to the reputation and prestige of the United States far beyond what the 3 years of inaction by the administration already have.

The Bosnian people do not deserve war. Americans do not deserve to die in support of a policy that will not bring peace to the Bosnians. What we can and must do is help the people of that nation help themselves. If we truly want to guarantee lasting peace in the Balkans, we need to give the Bosnian people the tools of peace: the means to defend themselves from renewed Serb aggression.

Mr. President, more than 3 months ago I introduced legislation to provide the Bosnian people with American arms and training that they need to defend themselves. That legislation calls upon the administration to lead an international effort to coordinate contributions from those countries who wish to join in helping the Bosnians acquire the means of self-defense.

I will do everything in my power to help the Bosnians acquire the means to defend themselves. But I cannot, I do not, and I will not support sending American soldiers to fight, and to die, in Bosnia for the sake of an agreement that offers no more than a brief pause while all sides prepare for the next round of Balkan wars.

Mr. President, I thank you. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Washington is recognized for 9 minutes.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I rise to express my qualified support for the deployment of United States military personnel as part of the NATO force to implement the Bosnia peace plan.

The President has made a compelling case to the American people in support of U.S. participation in the NATO peacekeeping force. He has said that the NATO military mission will be clear, limited, and achievable; and that the risks to our troops will be minimized.

Congress has had the opportunity to go over this plan carefully, through a series of extensive briefings and hearings, which have been held over the last few weeks by at least four committees. Through this process, we have gotten answers to many of our questions, but certainly not all of them.

As the polls and phone calls reveal, the public is extremely wary about this operation. They know this is a mission with an uncertain outcome, where American sons and daughters may lose their lives. They are worried that our troops will be dragged into a civil conflict, despite our intentions to the contrary.

I have set aside extra time over the last several weeks to meet with and hear from constituents on this issue, many of whom have sons, daughters, husbands and wives likely to be deployed in Bosnia. I have listened to their fears and reservations. They are understandably worried—about landmines, snipers, civil disorder, undisciplined local factions, hostage taking, and other risks inherent in this mission.

And like most Americans, my constituents wonder aloud why the nations of Europe have not been able to solve this crisis on their own. Knowing how pressing the needs are here at home, they are weary of the constant need for American leadership abroad. Many resent the U.S. in the role of global policeman—again.

I have also met with relief workers who have been working on the ground in Bosnia, to learn from their perspective how much rebuilding lies ahead for the people of this war-torn nation. This is an extremely important issue, because the success of NATO's military mission will be measured against the gains made in the civilian sector to reestablish a viable economic and political life throughout Bosnia.

While it is important to point out that NATO's implementation force, or IFOR, will not be responsible for the conduct of humanitarian operations, the two operations will work to complement one another. But the IFOR will not be a police force, and it will not conduct nation-building. Nor will the IFOR address the numerous issues surrounding the return of refugees. Rather, IFOR's mission is simple and straightforward —to keep the peace so that civilian and political leaders have an opportunity to rebuild Bosnian society.

Our military leadership has repeatedly reassured Congress that the limited nature of this mission can be accomplished in 1 year's time, with most of the military tasks contained in the agreement accomplished in the first 6 months. After that, IFOR's role will be to maintain a climate of stability so that the civil tasks outlined in the peace agreement can take root.

In the words of Secretary Perry, the goal is to ''break the cycle of violence'' so that the civilian efforts—economic development, free elections, and the return of refugees—can have an opportunity to take hold. But regardless of what the situation looks like 1 year from now, the Secretary has said that ''we must not be drawn into a posture of indefinite garrison.''

Mr. President, it is this very limited mission that I am agreeing to with my vote today. I want to be clear—my support for this mission is qualified. I will be following developments closely in the weeks and months ahead. While I believe it is in our national interests to participate in a limited way in this operation, I feel very strongly that once we have paved the way for the Bosnian people to make peace, our role will be over and we should leave.

Yes, we can provide the opportunity for peace. But if, after a year's time, the Bosnian people themselves have not seized this chance, we should and must leave.

Having said that, I do believe that what we are about to do is incredibly important. Certainly this deployment carries risks. But I believe those risks must be measured against the promise for peace this agreement contains. The conditions are right for peace in Bosnia. And like Secretary Perry, I have concluded that the risks to the United States of allowing the war to continue are greater than the risks of enforcing the peace.

I agree with the President, our Secretaries of Defense and State, and our Nation's top military leaders. The United States has critical political, economic and security interests in Europe, and the war in Bosnia threatens those interests. The Dayton peace plan is the first opportunity we have had to end the war, and I believe we have to give it a chance.

In implementing the peace agreement, NATO will be embarking on its first land operation in history. Every NATO country with the exception of Iceland will be committing troops to this operation. The United States will contribute one-third of the necessary troops for IFOR. The British will provide 13,000 troops, the French 8,000. In addition, more than a dozen non-NATO nations have indicated a willingness to participate.

Our troops will be headquartered in Tuzla, where they will also have with them a Nordic brigade of close to 4,500 troops. 1,000 of those Nordic troops have been stationed in the Tuzla area for over a year, and will be able to provide our troops with important information on the region and its risks. Perhaps most astonishingly, there will be a Russian brigade that will be a part of the American division, numbering several thousand troops.

The NATO mission, while carefully planned and trained for by our Nation's best military leaders, faces many uncertainties. We owe our troops no less than the finest training and equipment possible, and in this regard we can take great reassurance. We know that the troops we are sending to Bosnia are strong, capable and ready. They have undergone thorough and intensive training over the past several months. They have endured very rigorous and specific exercises, unique to the situation they will face in Bosnia, including mine training and basic combat proficiencies.

American troops will be heavily armed, and will have the authority to respond with decisive force to any threat to their own safety. Our troops will take their orders from the American General who commands NATO, General George Joulwan. For his part, General Joulwan has insisted that the daily training scenarios that our troops are subjected to be increasingly demanding, so that, in his words, ''the scrimmage should be harder than the game''.

Mr. President, one thing we do know for certain is that the nations of Europe have not been able to solve this crisis over the last 4 years. In absence of any clear leadership, day after day the war deepened, becoming a festering wound in the center of Europe. A quarter of a million lives have been lost to war, ethnic cleansing, and genocide. A generation of children has been terrorized and traumatized. Thousands of elderly have been cast from their homes and turned into refugees with no place to go.

It has been American leadership that finally made a difference. American leadership generated a cease fire. American leadership brought the parties to the peace table. And now it will take American leadership to ensure that NATO remains strong enough to prevent the peace from collapsing.

Many Americans—including my own constituents—question the need for NATO as we approach the next century. The Soviet Union has collapsed. Why, they ask, should America pay the money and put our troops on the line in support of an alliance whose time—in the eyes of some—has passed.

I believe we have a very direct national interest in ensuring that NATO remains an effective and credible security arrangement for the United States and our European allies. Ours is an alliance in support of democracy and freedom, and we are the leader of that alliance.

Now is not the time in history for America to question our leadership role in the world. Continued American global leadership is in our national interest, not only in the matter before us regarding Bosnia, but more generally in this post-cold war era. Nations around the world are watching. If the aggression that has taken place in the Balkans over the past 4 years were to go without challenge, other nations will take a lesson.

Congress gathered just yesterday to hear the moving speech of Israeli Prime Minister Shimon Peres, who faces the daunting task of keeping his Nation on the path toward peace in the wake of former Prime Minister Rabin's assassination.

Mr. Peres reminded us gently of the role America has played in this century, and the responsibilities we carry into the next. He urged us to accept what history has laid on our national shoulders. He reminded us that there are some things that only America can do. America alone, he reminded us, can keep the world free.

We do not know who will be in charge in Russia, China, or Iran 10 years from now. Those nations may be moving closer to democracy, or they may be led by repressive regimes with nuclear capabilities. We simply do not know today.

Because of the uncertainties we face in the world, we in the United States can not afford to fall back to the approach we took after World War I, when a weary nation said ''enough''. The vacuum was filled promptly, in that case with the most horrendous outcome.

Mindful of such history, I would echo the sentiments of President Clinton when he says, ''My fellow Americans, in this new era there are still times when America and America alone can and should make the difference for peace.''

To my own constituents, and to Americans across this great Nation of ours, I want to say: I know you are weary. But in my view, we do not have the luxury of wishing away the world and tending our own garden as if events around the world have no effect on us. We must continue to lead, and in doing so, we are most certainly serving our own national interests.

But you are right. This will be a difficult mission to undertake. The climate in Bosnia at this time of year is brutal, the terrain difficult, and the risks many. Even if all goes extremely well, we must be prepared for casualties. This is an inevitable fact of life that accompanies every deployment. We should remember, for example, that during Desert Shield, the staging phase before the Persian Gulf war began, we lost 84 American troops before even a single shot was fired. And although the situation we are entering in Bosnia is vastly different, it is tragically unavoidable that accidents and mishaps will claim the lives of some of those deployed. And so we must prepare ourselves as a Nation for this consequence.

But we must remember that throughout this ''American century'', as it has been called by some, the United States alone has set the standard to which so many nations now aspire. And in keeping with our vision as a people, since the end of the cold war we have led the international community in breaking new ground on behalf of democracy and the rule of law. In situations ranging from Cambodia to Haiti to Bosnia, we have helped to secure peace and freedom.

I think we have to acknowledge up front that as we undertake these endeavors, we do not fully know yet what

model works, and under what circumstances. And that is what makes votes like today's so difficult. But this is no excuse for this Nation or any other major world power to throw up our hands and walk away from the difficult problems and challenges we face in this post-cold war era.

On this point, I think the observations of Lakhdar Brahimi, who heads the U.N. operation in Haiti, are relevant. When asked what we have learned in Haiti that may be relevant to Bosnia, he said:

> . . . With operations like these (in Bosnia and Haiti), he said, the international community is embarking on something completely new for itself, and for which it does not yet have all the skills. It isn't even sure what it wants an certainly doesn't have all the money it needs to do it. So we take a country by the hand and accompany it a little bit, while it tries to stand on its own two feet. We don't do it perfectly, but it's still useful, even if it doesn't create paradise. But no one should kid themselves. It's a constant uphill struggle.

And so we should sober our expectations, but not dampen our resolve. For the sake of our own national interests and those of our allies, we have to move forward—with prayer and conviction.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Utah is recognized.

Mr. HATCH. I thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. President, this body now debates again whether we support the deployment of U.S. military forces into a European theater of war. We have debated this proposition twice before in this century.

In World War I, we sent our troops to engage in ''the war to end all wars.'' After the slaughter, after the victory, America withdrew from the European stage; and, before the century reached mid-point, we found ourselves again debating whether it was the U.S. role to engage in European wars.

The world was transformed by our historic decision to enter that war. The world was transformed by our decision after the victory to remain engaged; and, for most of the rest of the century, this country stood for the expansion of freedom and the containment of tyranny.

Perhaps some of us forgot that one of the reasons we were so motivated after World War II was because this nation had been horrified by the scenes of depravity under the Third Reich and the Japanese empire. When we saw the horrors of the concentration camps, we declared, with commitment, ''never again.''

Generations of Americans raised after that great allied victory truly believed that never again would we tolerate genocide in Europe. The very notion of civilization was redefined to include this idea—until the war broke out in Bosnia.

For almost 4 years, we have witnessed the horrors of ''ethnic cleansing'' in central Europe. Up until a few months ago, we regularly saw massacres of innocents, most often Muslims. ''Never again,'' came back to haunt us. ''Never again,'' became the hollow cry at the end of a century, taunting us that we could never assume progress from barbarity.

Many of us in this body believed we had to act. While we accepted that we could not make a persuasive case that U.S. troops needed to enforce or protect a vital interest, we believed that the world's remaining superpower had the power, the means, and the moral responsibility, to act.

We voted, again and again, to lift the immoral arms embargo on the young Bosnian state, which was largely unarmed, and was the target of the barbarians of ''ethnic cleansing.''

This summer, we passed legislation, with a strong bipartisan 69 votes, to lift the embargo.

The Administration, proclaiming concern for the Bosnians, argued that lifting the arms embargo would cause the Serbs to attack the eastern enclaves of Zepa and Srebrenica. For this grotesquely false reason—a reason bloodily refuted by the massacres in Srebrenica that occurred anyway—the Administration argued that we could not let the victims defend themselves. The Administration argued—again and again—that lifting the embargo would spread the war and would require the use of thousands of U.S. forces to extract the U.N. and allied forces. And so, the Administration argued that lifting the embargo was not an acceptable course of action.

Now, less than a month after the signing of the Dayton Accord, the Administration is deploying United States troops to Bosnia to implement the military annex of that accord.

There is a temporary truce in Bosnia. The killing has mostly stopped. The ethnic cleansing has not. And, the administration believes, most sincerely, that the deployment of the NATO Implementation Force, now known as IFOR, will, in the words of President Clinton, ''help create a secure environment so that the people of Bosnia can return to their homes, vote in free elections, and begin to rebuild their lives.'' The administration expects this to take approximately 1 year.

Mr. President, I respect the President's prerogative in foreign policy. I believe this is a principle we must respect if we are to convey the proper influence and power of this great Nation overseas. I supported this principle under previous Presidents, and I strongly objected when the Members of the opposing party in this body sought to frustrate Presidents Reagan and Bush.

I was disappointed when this body passed the resolution supporting President Bush's decision to deploy to Iraq by merely 52 votes. We had a clear vital interest at stake then. And, had we waited, we now know that our troops would have been subject to the weapons of mass destruction Saddam Hussein was on the verge of using.

Mr. President, I respect the principle of the President's prerogative in making foreign policy, but I have grave reservations—grave reservations—about the Bosnia policy on which the President is embarking.

But, I wish to make one point exceedingly clear: I believe that the Congress must show our support for the U.S. military. This Senator will always support American troops abroad.

I have recently learned that a Utah reserve unit will be among those troops deployed to this region, and several other Utah reservists have been put on alert. There is no way that this Senator will not do anything and everything to make sure that those troops have the backing they need in terms of equipment and materiel and moral support for what they do to serve our country's objectives.

But, appreciation and support for how well our troops carry out our policy does not mean we cannot question the policy itself as well as engage in some retrospective about U.S. policy.

I wish the President had taken a different approach on Bosnia 3 years ago. Candidate Clinton said he would lift the arms embargo. As I have said, I believe it was immoral to maintain an arms embargo against Bosnia while it was subjected to slaughter by a heavily armed Yugoslavia. I must say that, with his record, there is a credibility question when the President asserts it is the ''right'' thing to now send troops to Bosnia.

I believe that the Atlantic alliance is the most successful military alliance in the history of the world. The major democracies of the world held together throughout the cold war, and Europe remained secure. The world is still a dangerous place after the cold war, and I believe that NATO must remain relevant. I support the enlargement of the alliance, because I believe the alliance promotes political values as well as enforces security, and I wish to support the democracies of central Europe.

But NATO's credibility has suffered greatly during the Bosnia debacle. Tied by the dual key with the United Nations, the greatest military alliance was ineffective while genocide occurred. NATO stood by while cities and towns were shelled, while humanitarian convoys were turned back, while helicopters violated a no-fly zone. A NATO F–16 was shot out of the sky this summer by Serbs using Russian military hardware.

The Administration argues that NATO credibility is at stake. But I must ask: What happens if the I-For goes to Bosnia, and, after 1 year and the departure of I-For, the parties return to war? Will NATO be more credible for having gone to Bosnia with great fanfare, but having returned without success, or worse, with casualties we cannot justify?

This administration proclaims that this is a chance for peace in Bosnia. I

do not doubt the President's sincerity. And I do not doubt that the administration is motivated by noble notions. I fear, however, that its ideals are immature.

Peace is not the absence of conflict, Mr. President. We will always have conflict. Peace, I believe, is the management of conflict, the management of conflict so that it does not escalate into violence and war.

And, when I look at the Dayton Accord, Mr. President, and the record of this administration, I fear that many issues about managing the conflict remain unaddressed.

The administration has spoken about a clear exit strategy, partly because we in the Congress have demanded it. But if we do not have a vision of how to manage the conflict after our mission expires, I see very little reason to go in at all. We need a post-exit strategy, Mr. President, and I've heard very little of one.

A post-exit strategy—and the success of the I-For mission—depends on a number of factors. I believe these include, but are not limited to: First, ensuring that the Bosnian Serbs do not pursue territorial gains beyond those they have won in this ignominious partition known as the Dayton Accord; second, completing the agreement between Croatia and Serbia over Eastern Slavonia; third, building and maintaining a cooperative relationship between the Bosnians and the Croatians; and, most importantly, fourth, maintaining the political and military viability of the Bosnian state.

Elements within the Bosnian Serbs have been proclaiming against the Dayton Accord since the day they were signed. Demonstrations have been staged almost every day. Are we to proceed while these rogue elements threaten, with arms, to ignore the accord?

The administration tells us that it will rely on President Milosevic of Serbia to control these elements. President Milosevic has been very cooperative and effective, we are told.

President Milosevic, I recall, was the instigator of the war against Bosnia and has reneged on his promises on numerous occasions over the past 4 years. Perhaps Milosevic has converted—and I believe in conversion—but I have doubts about the sincerity of those who convert after a mild NATO bombing campaign.

Mr. President, I still do not know what the administration intends to do if our U.S. forces are subject to mortar attacks from rogue elements.

For example, if we're attacked from a populated area by rogue elements that move freely within it, how will we respond? With a phone call to Belgrade? How does President Clinton plan to hold President Milosevic accountable for keeping the Bosnian Serbs in line with the accord?

I am also greatly concerned about the agreement between Croatia and Serbia over eastern Slavonia. We should recall the brutal occupation of that Croatian territory. We should recall the pictures of the city of Vukovar, left a smoking rubble by the Serbs, complete with mass graves.

Since then the Serbian Army has occupied the area, cleansed it, and extracted its natural resources. The Croats and Serbs signed an agreement just before the Dayton Accord to return eastern Slavonia to Croatia. The agreement allows for 1 year to revert the territory to Croatia, but it has a 1 year extension clause, to be exercised by either party.

The implementation of the international force to monitor the territory is already stalling. I predict here that the Serbs will ask for that 1 year extension; and, 1 year from now, Eastern Slavonia will still be occupied by the forces of Belgrade.

It is a powder keg. If we do not ensure the peaceful transfer of that occupied territory, there will be a war within 2 years, and that war will spread to Bosnia, and the I-For mission, with its casualties, will have been for naught.

Mr. President, I am deeply concerned that the administration has not focused on this issue.

Mr. President, we need to do more to strengthen the ties begun with the Washington Agreement last year to build the Croat-Muslim relationship.

I have little expectation that the Serbian entity will ever participate in the unitary government of Bosnia-Hercegovina. But without the Croats and Muslims cooperating, Mr. President, we may end up participating in a three-way partition conducted by ethnic cleansing.

Since the beginning of this war, I have argued for a policy of lift-and-strike. Lift the arms embargo on Bosnia and Croatia, and allow them to defend themselves against Serbian aggression. Use air power to dissuade the aggressors while the victims arm themselves.

We saw a version of lift-and-strike this summer, when the Croatian Army, strong again, recaptured the Krajina and coordinated with the Bosnians to deliver military defeats to the Serbs. Our NATO forces went into the skies in August and September to force the Serbs to accept a choice: more military defeats or a negotiated settlement. Lift-and-strike worked, Mr. President, as we said it would.

Lift-and-strike was posited on the premise that a balance of power on the ground would effect a real peace, a peace based on the cessation of violence through deterrence.

Now that the President has decided to deploy the I-For, I believe that it is essential that we ensure that Bosnia is able to defend itself. That, Mr. President, is the only way that we can guarantee that the Bosnians shall not be subject to more ethnic cleansing, to more deadly attacks—unless we plan to keep I-For there forever.

Mr. President, if we are not absolutely dedicated to arming the Bosnian Government, we should be realistic enough to know that the war will reignite shortly after IFOR departs. And then, Mr. President, we'll ask, what was the point? For what did NATO expend its credibility? For what did America risk its sons and daughters? A decent interval to another war is not an acceptable answer, Mr. President.

So 5 years before the end of this bloody century, we debate again sending our troops to Europe. We didn't need to come to this point. The Dayton Accord is abstract, the realities on the ground brutal and complicated. We didn't need to come to this point.

But America has given its word, and credibility of that word, we are told, is at stake. Let me preface my final comments by saying that I am equally concerned about America's standing abroad and about maintaining our leadership in NATO.

But, our credibility is more threatened, I believe, by pursuing a mission with guaranteed casualties and uncertain goals, than it is by telling our allies now that we do not support this policy, this deployment, and that we will arm the Bosnians until they can defend themselves.

But if this policy will be implemented—and already our troops are arriving in Bosnia—we must try to improve it. If we are to effect any positive influence here, Mr. President, we must insist that we arm the Bosnian government so that when we leave, we are not a few steps ahead of the next conflagration.

Therefore, Mr. President, I support the Hutchison–Inhofe resolution opposing the President's decision to deploy, but strongly support the Dole-McCain resolution commending U.S. troops and setting conditions for the deployment which, I hope, will increase the possibility that this mission will not have been a waste of blood, treasure, and, yes, credibility.

Mr. President, I commend the majority leader for his statesmanship in recognizing that President Clinton is our President, that he does have a right to put these troops there, a constitutional right, and once they are there, we have an obligation, as patriots, to stand with them and to help them.

So I will support the Dole-McCain resolution, but I also support the Hutchison–Inhofe resolution as well.

Mr. President, this is a serious thing. I have been over that land. I have been over that territory. I have met with people on all sides of these issues. I have read the histories of the last 600 years of that area. And I have to tell you, I think putting our young people there is a tragic mistake. But once they are there, I am going to do everything in my power to support them.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Vermont is recognized for 7 minutes.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, the debate over whether the United States should contribute its troops to a NATO

peacekeeping force in Bosnia will be the focus of many speeches on this floor in the coming days. It is a subject all of us have anticipated and pondered and wrestled with for some months now, and it is one of those decisions that no one likes to make. It is fraught with uncertainties and the undeniable likelihood that Americans will be injured or killed.

There will be many chances to speak on this, but having thought about it for some time and discussed it with the President and Secretary of Defense and others over the past weeks, and after listening to the President's speech last night and the responses of some of those who oppose sending troops, I want to say a few words as the debate begins.

Mr. President, even before the peace agreement was signed at Dayton the House of Representatives passed legislation to prevent the President from deploying United States troops to enforce a peace agreement without the consent of Congress. I believe the President should seek the approval of Congress before sending troops to Bosnia, although I do not believe the Constitution requires it in this instance where the parties have signed a peace agreement. I felt it was both unhelpful and unnecessary for the House to pass legislation in the midst of the negotiations and before a peace agreement was signed.

But just as President Bush sought congressional approval for sending United States troops to the Persian Gulf—although half a million were there before approval was given—President Clinton has sought congressional approval, and there will be ample time to debate it before the formal signing of the agreement.

The decision to send Americans into harms way is the most difficult and dangerous that any President has to make. It should be done only when a compelling national interest is at stake, and when there is no other alternative.

Like many or perhaps even most Senators, the majority of my constituents, at least of those Vermonters who have contacted me, do not believe that it is in our national interest to send Americans to Bosnia. They genuinely fear another costly, drawn out quagmire like Vietnam. Some of them fought in that war, or had family members who died there. Others fear a debacle like Somalia, where in a matter of days a well-intentioned humanitarian mission became a poorly-thought out, ill-prepared peacemaking mission that ended in tragedy.

It is the President's job to convince the American people that Bosnia is not Vietnam, it is not Somalia, and that our national interests compel us to take part. He made a good start last night. There are still important questions that need answers—the President said as much himself—but I am convinced that the case for sending Americans to Bosnia can be made, and I intend to help the President make it.

Mr. President, in the past 4 years, a quarter of a million people, the vast majority defenseless civilians, have lost their lives in the former Yugoslavia. We have all read the blood curdling reports of hundreds and even thousands of people being rounded up at gun point and systematically executed or even buried alive.

Countless others have had their throats cut after being horribly tortured. Some have been made to eat the flesh and drink the blood of their countrymen. Thousands of women have been raped. Men have been forced to watch their wives and daughters raped and killed before their eyes. All simply because of their ethnicity, or because they lived on land others wanted for themselves.

The war has produced two million refugees, victims of ethnic cleansing. Hundreds of thousands more have lived in squalor for years in the rubble of what remains of their homes, without electricity, heat or running water.

There are many, including myself, who believe that NATO should have acted much earlier and with far greater force to stop the genocide in Bosnia. I opposed the use of American ground troops to try to win the war, but we gave too much deference to those who said that airpower would never compel the Serbs to negotiate peace. NATO should have been given the authority to use unrelenting force when UN resolutions were violated time and again with impunity.

Our greatest collective failure was to put the United Nations in charge of a peacekeeping mission where there was no peace to keep, and when it was unwilling or unable to back up its own threats. These failures, which caused grievous damage to NATO's credibility, will haunt us for years to come.

But the situation has changed dramatically since then. Sustained NATO bombing, coupled with gains by the Moslem and Croat forces on the battlefield, have shown the Serbs that they cannot win what they set out to achieve. The exhaustion of the warring factions, coupled with a period of extraordinarily forceful American diplomacy, has created an unprecedented opportunity to end one of the most brutal wars the world has seen in half a century.

There should be no mistake. The credibility of the United States Government is deeply invested in the success of the peace agreement, and success of the agreement depends absolutely on NATO's enforcement of it. The parties signed with that understanding. At the same time, NATO's own credibility and effectiveness depend on US leadership. Indeed, without US participation, there will be no NATO force, and the peace agreement will almost certainly collapse.

Mr. President, since the breakup of the Soviet Union and the end of the cold war, NATO's future has been uncertain. Some have suggested that NATO has outlived its usefulness. Others say that since the rationale for NATO—deterring a Soviet invasion of Europe—is gone, NATO should become a political alliance. Still others want to quickly expand NATO to include all or most of Eastern Europe, and perhaps even some of the former Soviet republics.

I mention this because NATO's future is one of the most compelling reasons why it is essential for the United States to participate in a NATO peacekeeping force in Bosnia.

I have been among the strongest supporters of assistance to Russia and the other former Soviet States. A democratic Russia is obviously a major foreign policy priority for the United States. Despite many setbacks, there has been remarkable progress in Russia, Ukraine and elsewhere in the former Soviet Union. But who can predict the next decade? Who can say that the fervent nationalism that remains strong there will not increase to a point when it becomes threatening? It is simply too soon to say what lies beyond this transitional period. I have been reluctant to support the rapid expansion of NATO without a thorough discussion of the implications, for fear that it could fuel the very nationalism in Russia that we seek to discourage.

But neither am I among those who see no role for NATO today. On the contrary, the United States has an enormous stake in preserving NATO's strength. While NATO's focus will undoubtedly shift over time, the future holds too many uncertainties, and there are too many areas of potential conflict around the world where important interests of the United States and our allies are at stake, to allow NATO's strength to erode.

There is no other alliance that comes close to NATO, in power, in readiness, and in importance to the United States. NATO may not have sought the role of peacekeeper in Bosnia, but neither can it avoid it.

Mr. President, I cannot say whether this peace agreement will survive the test of time. Perhaps no one can. There is ample reason to be pessimistic, given the history of broken promises and ethnic hatred in the former Yugoslavia. Since the agreement was signed, it has become clear than no party is completely satisfied, and some have expressed grave misgivings with some aspects of it. If the agreement unravels, NATO Forces may be forced to withdraw, rather than be drawn into the fighting. Even withdrawal would be risky.

But virtually everyone knowledgeable about the situation there agrees that this is by far the best chance for peace since the war began 4 years ago. We and our European allies have an immense interest in preventing the continuation of a destabilizing war in Europe, and I believe we must take this chance.

The President has taken a courageous step, a step that reflects the best of this country. Every American should

consider the alternative. More mass murder. More towns shelled and burned. More starving children. More orphans. More horrifying atrocities that are reminiscent of the dark ages. If this does not compel us to help enforce an agreement we brokered to end this calamity, what further amount of inhuman brutality would it take? Should we wait for the slaughter of another hundred thousand, or two hundred thousand?

The President is right. We have a moral responsibility to take part. The Europeans were unable to end the war themselves. United States leadership was not the only factor, but without it there would be no peace agreement, and the war would go on indefinitely. We should be proud of it, and stand behind it.

Some have suggested that we can lead without sending troops. I disagree. We cannot maintain our credibility as the leader of NATO if we are not prepared to assume some of the risk. We should remember that two thirds of the NATO Force will be troops from our NATO allies and others.

Mr. President, our troops are the best trained in the world, but we cannot eliminate the risks. There are 2 million landmines in Bosnia alone, hidden under mud and snow. Each one cost only a few dollars, but one false step could mean the loss of any American soldier's legs or life. The Pentagon says that landmines are among the most serious threats our troops will face there.

This is ironic, since the Pentagon has been actively lobbying against my efforts to show leadership by halting the use of antipersonnel landmines, which claim hundreds of innocent lives each week. Two-thirds of the Senate voted for it, but the Pentagon refuses. In the past few months, several of our European allies have stopped their use and production of these indiscriminate weapons, but the Pentagon refuses.

A quarter of the Americans killed in the Persian Gulf died from landmines. A quarter of American casualties in Vietnam were from mines. I can only wonder how many more Americans will needlessly lose their legs or their lives from landmines before the Pentagon gets the message.

We cannot eliminate the risks, but President Clinton has established the right conditions before U.S. troops can be deployed. If the mission is limited in time, clear in scope and achievable, as the President has insisted, we should support it. Our troops must be backed by broad rules of engagement that enable them to defend themselves with whatever amount of preemptive force is needed in any circumstance. That does not mean waiting to shoot until they are shot at.

Mr. President, I expect to speak again as the debate on this unfolds. I intend to support the President, and I expect there will be Senators I deeply respect who are on the other side. But at the end of the day, if Americans are sent to Bosnia as I believe they will be, I have no doubt that we all will support them, and we will all be proud of them.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCCONNELL). The Senator from Kansas is recognized.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, there have been many eloquent speeches given today and last night. I am not sure that much new can be said. Over the last several years, we have debated the pros and cons of what to do about Bosnia, and I have begun to feel like Hamlet. If I could just review some of my thinking at this point, I would like to.

The tragedy in former Yugoslavia is truly momentous. Nobody will deny that who has watched this occur over the last several years. We have witnessed, in the past several years, atrocities in Europe that we vowed would never again be allowed. We have stood by while our most important and fundamental military alliance, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, that is a fundamental part of our Nation's security, tottered on the brink of disaster, its members squabbling and indecisive while war waged on Europe's doorstep. And we have struggled to understand the nuances of a conflict fueled by both ancient animosities and a contemporary hunger for power, by both the collapse of communism and the friction of ethnic and religious hatred.

For most Americans, this is a distant war in an obscure land about issues that do not directly affect our interests. All that may be true. And, yet, we could not ignore it. For the past 4 years, we have feared, above all, that it would spread and embroil the great powers, particularly the United States and Russia, on opposite sides of a war neither of us wanted. We have felt deep compassion and remorse as this war, like all wars, took its greatest toll on the innocents: in refugees driven from their lands, in homes and towns and villages destroyed, in a generation of children, Mr. President, whose lives have been shattered.

We have tried to avoid involvement because our direct national interests were not at stake. This, we said, was a European problem. And, yet, because we understood that important national interests could be put at risk if the fighting continued, we could not simply wash our hands of the matter.

So America and our European allies took a series of halting steps and tentative measures that over 4 years tarnished our image and called into question our resolve. We imposed an arms embargo on Yugoslavia and later came to regret it. We established safe havens and then failed to protect them against assault. We promised to deliver food and humanitarian supplies to refugees and displaced persons but then failed to use the force necessary to deliver.

Those efforts all failed. As a consequence of those failures, we had become involved in Bosnia. American credibility, prestige, and leadership, the intangibles that are so important to our national security around the world, all were damaged. We found ourselves in the worst of situations. America put itself on the line in Bosnia, but we had made no commitment to shaping the outcome.

Now we are at a crossroads. The issue before us is whether America should help bring this war to a close. We should, and through our good offices and diplomatic leadership we have done so. I share President Clinton's view that the United States should be a leader for peace. However, I also share the deep reservations of many and that have been spoken of many times today about sending American forces into the Balkans. In my mind, the key to the success of the NATO operation is not the achievement of a military objective, but rather the commitment of the Bosnian, Croatian, and Serbian leaders and their people to peace. Absent that strong commitment by the parties to make the Dayton accord work over the long term, no number of international troops will achieve peace. Mr. President, I am not convinced that the three parties to the Dayton accord will stand by their commitments and sustain the peace. We certainly would all pray for that result.

All three parties have incentives to sign now, but they do not have the same incentive to keep the peace come spring or after our troops depart. By setting an arbitrary 1-year timetable for the departure of our forces, we invite the parties to wait us out. The Dayton accord is full of ambiguities with empty guarantees of peace, and that probably would not have been possible.

Yet the reality is that our troops are going. They are already, many of them, there. Thousands more will follow in the coming days. Whether we like it or not, the President's decision to deploy is behind us. The United States has made a commitment to this operation. Having made that commitment, America must not cut and run. To do so would send a message of weakness around the world that would damage our national interests in a way that the Yugoslavian war itself never could. The reality is that we are involved in Bosnia, and all Americans must do what we can to see this operation through to a successful conclusion.

The decision now before us, to my mind, should involve how best to build the prospects for success. I believe Congress has little choice but to support our forces and the operation, because to do otherwise would be to diminish our chances for success, and success is the task at hand. Today we are considering three approaches to the matter. Each is troubling, I suggest. One has already been rejected. I do not believe we should cut off funding with our troops already on the ground. Provoking a constitutional crisis at this point would not serve either our troops or our national interests. I also do not believe expressing support for our troops

but opposing the President's decision to send them enhances the mission's prospect for success. That would send an unequivocal message that America's support for this operation is shallow; a message that would be heard, I think, loud and clear by the parties in former Yugoslavia.

That leaves us with the approach of the Dole-McCain resolution. I commend the authors of that resolution, who have struggled with the very basic but difficult question left unanswered by the Dayton accords: How will we know when our mission is completed? Or put another way, how did we plan to accomplish a lasting peace in the region after our troops have gone?

I have serious reservations about the dual policy the Dole-McCain resolution advocates as a solution to this difficult question. On the one hand, American troops would participate in ostensibly neutral peacekeeping operation to separate the warring parties. On the other hand, America would lead an effort to arm and train one of the parties, the Bosnian Moslems. I have had reservations about this policy articulated by the administration, and I have deeper reservations about endorsing or even expanding that commitment in a congressional resolution. An American-led effort to arm and train, to put our troops in Bosnia at greater risk, could undermine provisions of the Dayton accord that obligate all parties to reduce their armed forces and could lay the foundation for an arms race in the Balkans. Any American effort to arm and train the Bosnian Federation also must recognize and deal with the delicate and contradictory nature of the new Moslem-Croat alliance.

Finally, our European allies have serious reservations about a United States-led effort to arm the Bosnian Federation. While many of my colleagues have decried European leadership on Bosnia, I believe that as a member of NATO we have an obligation to coordinate our policies closely with our allies. But despite these concerns, the Dole-McCain resolution is, to my mind, the only real option now before the Senate. I do support it because I firmly believe that Congress must go on record in support of this operation which already is underway.

The President has made clear that the operation will proceed with or without congressional support, but I am not sure it can succeed without congressional support. With our troops at risk I believe success must be our highest priority. I yield the floor.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss the very important question of whether or not to authorize the deployment of United States ground troops to Bosnia. let me start with where I have been on this issue and continue with where I am today.

Mr. President, I have long believed that Bosnia itself is not a strategic interest of the United States. I have agreed more with Bismarck who said that the Balkans were ''not worth the loss of one Pomeranian grenadier'' than I have with those European politicians who have seen it as the contested terrain necessary to extend their countries' reach to the middle East. In essence, the Bosnian conflict represents the conflict of Western Christendom, Orthodox Christendom and Islam and it flows from grievances passed on from grandparent to grandchild over centuries.

While the United States has long had a vital interest in the security of Europe in general, there has been no indication over the past 4 years that the conflict in Bosnia would spread in any significant destablilizing way, notwithstanding the legitimate worries about Kosovo, Macedonia, Greece, and Turkey. Further, while the United States has humanitarian interests related to countering ethnic cleansing and other barbaric conduct, I do not think that it is possible for the United States to intervene and to stop every ethnic conflict in the world. Why Bosnia and not Rwanda has never been answered by the architects of our current policy.

The most striking thing about the Bosnian war is that virtually no one, from the beginning, championed pluralism. Instead, we accepted the premises of the warring parties and lost the high ground.

I also believe that thee have been a lot of missed opportunities to curtail the horrors during the four years of this conflict. Because we did not seize them, we have been left with a much more difficult situation. For example, in the Bush administration, the United States, fresh from the triumph in the Gulf, could have threatened massive air power to deter the Serbian President Milosevic from pursuing by force his ambition to create a greater Serbia. We failed to do so and the conflict expanded exponentially into war.

Similarly, in the first 6 to 12 months of the Clinton administration, I believe that there was another opportunity for the United States to warn Milosevic and then to act directly against him if he persisted. The United States could have sent a high level emissary to apply diplomatic pressure and to threaten air attacks to deter Serb aggression. But the United States failed to act in any meaningful way and the war has continued for a period longer than the Korean war.

In the absence of U.S. action, I have supported equalizing the military imbalance in the region. While certainly not a solution to the underlying conflict, military parity is crucial to any last peace between the Gosnian Moslems, the Croats, and the Serbs. As a result, I voted repeatedly for lifting the arms embargo. But once again, we missed an opportunity and the embargo and military imbalance have persisted.

That is where I have been on this issue.

Mr. President, I recognize that some things have changed. We have a peace agreement initialed by Moslems, Croats, and Serbs. We have the commitment of NATO to secure the military aspects of this agreement and we have the commitment of President Clinton to deploy 20,000 United States ground troops to Bosnia and another 5,000 troops to Croatia, as part of this agreement. Where Europe failed to get agreement, America succeeded but the results put us in the middle of Europe's most volatile region as not only a coguarantor, but the broker of the agreement.

Mr. President, I recognize also that several things have not changed. The ethnic enmity between the parties continues. The Moslem-Croat Federation remains fragile and divisions persist among the leadership of the various parties to the agreement.

As importantly, I still do not believe that Bosnia itself is a strategic interest of the United States. Indeed, if there were no counterbalancing factors, it would be my position that the United States should not deploy United States ground forces to Bosnia.

One of the primary problems that we are facing is that we are left to make this decision in a conceptual vacuum. Although the cold war has ended, no one has provided a coherent vision of the post-cold war world. Rather, ad hocism tends to rule the day.

This void is particularly pertinent for the United States. The United States is the most powerful country in the world. With that power, however, comes certain responsibilities. There comes the leadership responsibility to formulate a coherent vision of the world. Yet, no one, including the administration and its predecessor, has defined the role of the United States or NATO or their respective strategic interests since the days of the cold war. But those days have ended. Time after time since 1990, we have looked in the rearview mirror instead of ahead to the horizon of a new world. The retreat to a strategy of ''cold war lite'' is reflected in bloated defense budgets, confused priorities and a gradual erosion of American influence abroad.

I believe an administration's highest foreign policy priority is to develop a new conceptual framework and I believe a President's role is to first see that it is done and second, to articulate it often enough and persuasively enough so that the American people and the rest of the world know where we are going in foreign policy and why.

The administration's proposal for United States troop deployment in Bosnia is a prime example of the reigning ad hocism. And it brings with it, several grave problems:

To begin, how do we define success? The administration has not clearly stated how it will evaluate the success of the mission. Focusing only on the military mission, the administration has left great ambiguity, if not confusion, regarding the issues of refugees and disarmament. The result is very dangerous because you cannot really have an exit strategy unless you know

what it is you are supposed to achieve. For an exit strategy is not a deadline, it is a process for continuously evaluation means against goals.

By stating that the mission will not extend beyond a year, the administration also invites delayed violations. As a mechanism of control, a time limit leads to loss of control. A stated 1 year termination of our involvement is a temptation for the contending parties simply to delay a showdown for a year.

In hoping for a limited mission that could simultaneously solve the deeper conflicts, there has been an incomplete disclosure of where this action will lead. In a year from now, will United States troops be withdrawn only to allow the Croats and Serbs to carve up Moslem Bosnia? Will we feel any better just because our military objectives have been ostensibly achieved? Will the United States' leadership role be maintained and NATO's role restored if Bosnia falls into renewed conflict upon the withdrawal of NATO? Unfortunately, I think the answer is no. Do the Croats yearn so much for economic ties to Europe and the Serbs fear so much the resumption of sanctions that they will restrain themselves from conquering the Moslem enclaves once United States troops leave? Again, I fear the answer is no. Once we are down the road and involved, the most likely outcome is for this mission to continue—for NATO, with United States troops, to engage in the protection of Bosnia enclaves for the indefinite future.

A related, but distinct problem is the disconnect between the defined mission and our objectives. If the administration is to be believed, our mission is only military and can be completed in 1 year. Nevertheless, to justify the deployment of U.S. troops in this case, the administration has defined certain humanitarian interests—to prevent ethic cleansing, to prevent a renewed conflict between the parties, and to create one federated Bosnian state. Neither the limited military mission that the administration has laid out, nor the hoped for year of ''breathing space'' will be able to accomplish those objectives. The administration is taking the rhetorical high ground, but its plan falls far short of delivering on the rhetoric.

No one is saying now that the Moslem enclaves are going to be the Berlins of the last years of the twentieth century with NATO forces placing a tripwire around them and protecting them in a dangerous world. Instead, the administration trumpets the brevity of the mission as if American forces 6 months on the ground is an inoculation against the deep hatreds that caused the ethic cleansing in the first place. Such an attitude, from my perspective, is naive and wrong. I think the time has come for the administration to level with the American people about the logical end result of this mission. Only a lasting peace will avert us from being faced by Christmas 1996 with the choice of a longer commitment or failure.

In addition, there has yet to be any sufficiently comprehensive definition of either the rules of engagement or contingency plans. What will U.S. troops do in the case of cross-border conflicts, if the Serbs attack the Croats or the Croats attack the Serbs? What will United States troops do if the French troops in Saragevo are directly attacked with the resulting loss of many French lives? Under what if any circumstances will U.S. forces be withdrawn prior to the completion of the military mission. These are very important issues, but there still are no precise answers as there were not when the Bosnian Serbs took UNPROFOR hostage following NATO bombing.

Lacking a coherent vision, there also appears to be little recognition of the implications of this 1 year decision and its potential outcome for our strategic interests throughout the world. If we withdraw our troops and Serbs or Croats subjugate the Moslem enclaves, there will be, for example, significant repercussions in the Islamic world, in the Persian Gulf, and elsewhere. Again the 1 year time horizon could put our withdrawal at a time of maximum uncertainty or danger in the Islamic world—a time when the old, well-known voices could be replaced by more strident fundamentalists—who regard renewed Bosnian horrors as a rallying cry and the United States as the villain who promised and then reneged. Whether such repercussions are worth the interests we are ostensibly saving have not, as far as I know, been addressed.

It is worth remembering the example of Ronald Reagan's Lebanon intervention. The Marines arrived, departed, returned after the Sabra and Shatila massacres and then spent over a year just hunkering down with tragic results.

Finally, those who say that there is no alternative are posing a false choice and ignoring the last 4 years. One might choose deployment as the best of two bad choices. But that does not mean that there were no more choices. A policy of strength that proceeded from a new strategic framework and was pursued from the beginning of the breakup of Yugoslavia was the alternative that no one talks about because it was not developed.

Despite these and other problems with this ad hoc approach, I recognize that there are counterbalancing concerns. Most notably, the President has pledged U.S. participation and the deployment of U.S. ground troops. I have said twice that the United States has not strategic interest in Bosnia itself. Paradoxically, because the deployment decision proceeded ad hoc, it places more emphasis on the downside of undercutting the solemn commitment of our President and of undermining the United States role in Europe where we do have strategic interests. As a result, we in Congress have a new level of responsibility. With all said, I believe that the word of the United States and the ability of the President to lead and to make decisions as leader and Commander-in-Chief, are important elements of the United States' world position. The decision to deploy, however poorly thought out, if carried through and maintained over time, will send a strong message worldwide. It will, for example, show the Chinese that the American concern for human rights does not single them out, but is part of our worldview. It will say to the Japanese and other parties in Northeast Asia that an American President can deliver on his word. It will say to the Islamic world that, as with the gulf war, a non-treaty commitment made by the United States can extend to Islamic territory as well as to Israel, and it will say to all of Europe that the United States remains a European power.

Further, while not of major significance, there are benefits from United States and Russian forces working together in the same field. By engaging in a joint military mission that has very limited objective, I believe that we will be helping Russia to take positive steps in its post-cold war development and once again, it will have geopolitical value in Asia by showing that the United States and Russia are building a new spirit of cooperation and friendship.

There are also potential benefits for NATO, although as I noted before, potential dangers as well. NATO has been searching for a defining role since the fall of the Berlin Wall. This, the first actual NATO deployment, not just a patrol or reconnaissance mission, marks NATO's departure into peacekeeping. This mission will include troops from the new European democracies, thereby providing a more useful bridge into the West than the ill-conceived drive for immediate NATO expansion. In addition, this mission has brought the French back into the NATO command structure, making NATO a more complete European force. One hopes, however, that the ambiguities in the agreement will not lead to alliance bickering and disagreements, even though the seeds have already been planted—with disagreements already arising over refugees, disarmament and the arming and training of the Bosnian Moslems.

Having weighed all of these considerations, I have reluctantly decided that it is in the best interests of the United States to support the deployment of U.S. troops at this time. I believe, however, that, contrary to administration rhetoric, this will be a very difficult and long mission. I urge the administration to level with the American people now and to do all within its power to improve the circumstances under which U.S. troops are deployed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New Jersey has expired.

Under the unanimous-consent agreement, I would recognize a Republican.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois has been waiting. We will yield him time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I thank you and I thank my colleague from Texas for her courtesy.

There are some basic questions. Why have an Armed Forces for the United States? Why have a Chicago Police Department? Or a Louisville Police Department? One reason is to have stability, in a community and in the world community. And here, let me add that the great threat to the world today, unlike 10 years ago, is instability. Ten years ago it was nuclear annihilation.

The second reason for having an armed force and for having a police department is to save lives. Are there risks? Yes. If there is a problem in one part of the city of Chicago you may send in the police department. And, if there are problems around the world, the United States, along with the community of nations, may have to use the armed force that we had. There are, however, for the Chicago Police Department and the U.S. Armed Forces, greater risks in not maintaining stability here.

Let me add, while I support the President in this endeavor, the one thing that does concern me is the talk about getting out in 1 year. I hope that can happen. I hope we can be out in 6 months. I think the probability is, if our mission is to succeed—and it is important that it succeed—that we are likely to have to be there 2 or 3 years; maybe not with 20,000 soldiers, but with a substantial armed force.

I was critical of George Bush for not moving early, when problems erupted. And I cheered, in August 1992, when Bill Clinton made a campaign speech criticizing George Bush for not acting.

Then when Bill Clinton came in, I was critical of him for not acting. But I think what he is doing now is right. It is right for stability because of the danger of the spread of war.

If we do not follow through on this peace—and it is a peace, tenuous as it is—if we do not follow through, this is inevitably going to spread to Macedonia and Albania. Macedonia has more ethnic Turks than any other country, and Turkey has made clear, if there are problems in Macedonia, Turkey is going to move in. Our friends in Greece have made clear, if Turkey moves in, they are going to move if—and this thing will escalate very, very quickly. You will have hundreds of thousands of Americans—Armed Forces people—involved in a war, not 20,000 maintaining a peace.

The second thing we should remember, there are not too many clear lessons in history, but one of the clear lessons of history is religious wars spread very easily. What we have in Bosnia—nothing is completely clean there—but you have primarily a Moslem force, a Roman Catholic force, and an Orthodox Christian force. If anyone thinks that when Moslem forces in Bosnia are under attack that Moslems in Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, and Indonesia, and elsewhere are going to pay no attention to that, you are dreaming. Religious wars spread very, very easily.

In terms of saving lives, it is very clear we should act. We have the agreement reached in Dayton, to the credit of this administration, the State Department, and others who were participants. Bosnia is half the size of Ohio. Bosnia has seen 250,000 people killed, 2 million people displaced.

We went into Desert Storm, invaded a country after a short time, and I do not know whether history is going to judge my vote against acting that quickly, though I said I was for using economic sanctions first and then acting. But I feared, if we acted, we would simply perpetuate Saddam Hussein in power. But make no mistake about it: One of the reasons we acted was oil.

Are we willing to act to save oil but not save lives? I do not think that is what America stands for.

I have heard on this floor reference to Somalia as a great disaster. Let me tell you. Somalia was George Bush's finest hour. Hundreds of thousands of lives were saved. The mistake was made, and I was at the White House when we worked out the compromise that we would have to leave before too long. And I see I am being signaled for time. I ask unanimous consent for 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, Somalia saved lives. The mistake was in pulling out precipitously. I fear we may make the same mistake in Bosnia.

Finally, we have made a commitment to NATO. We have to live up—or we should live up—to that commitment.

Then I would add one other point. That is a word of gratitude to Senator BOB DOLE for being a statesman on this issue. He is not gaining any votes in Republican primaries in terms of the Republican nomination, but he is doing what a U.S. Senator ought to do, and that is look toward what is best for our country. What is best for our country right now is to back President Clinton.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I ask for 5 minutes. If I could be notified after 4 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, others have recounted mistakes and missed opportunities that have led us to this moment, a moment when 20,000 U.S. troops are either on their way or will shortly be on their way to Bosnia.

I will not take the time of the Senate this evening to recount these facts. They have been talked about in great detail already today.

The fact is, Mr. President, we are where we are. As we debate, and we have debated three different resolutions today, the essential facts are as follows:

Fact No. 1: In 1993, the President made a commitment to deploy ground troops in support of a Bosnia peacekeeping mission.

Fact 2: This guarantee was a condition or underlying understanding of the entire Dayton peace agreement.

Fact 3: The President has now ordered these troops to Bosnia. Some have already arrived.

Mr. President, the troops are going to Bosnia. They are going to Bosnia no matter what this Congress does. They are going to Bosnia no matter which resolution is approved or not approved. That is a fact.

Fact 4: There are clearly not sufficient votes in Congress to override the President's veto of a bill that would prohibit funding of the troops. In fact, earlier today, there were only 22 votes on this floor—22 votes—to in fact cut off these funds.

Mr. President, with these facts in mind, what then should our objectives be today as we debate these resolutions? What do we want to accomplish? What can we reasonably expect to accomplish?

Mr. President, the question before us today is I believe a rather narrow one. Which resolution will be the most valuable in achieving our objectives? What can Congress try to accomplish this evening?

Mr. President, I would suggest that we have three goals.

First, the most important, unconditionally support our troops.

Second, to enhance the odds of them leaving as scheduled within 1 year.

And, third, to increase the chances of this mission being successful.

I believe the Dole resolution—Dole-McCain resolution—can help shape and help influence our Bosnia policy and can improve it. It does this in part by ensuring the training and arming of the Federation of Bosnia, so that they can provide for their own defense after the NATO troops leave.

Mr. President, the Dole resolution gives more support than any of other resolutions to our troops. The Dole resolution supports their mission and does so in clear terms. It ensures that America speaks with a clearer voice.

Mr. President, for the above reasons, it is my intention this evening to vote in favor of the Dole-McCain resolution.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, just 3 weeks ago, the warring parties in Bosnia initialed a peace agreement in Dayton, OH. That announcement marked the first real hope for an end to the tragic conflict in the Balkans which has left hundreds of thousands dead or injured and produced over a million refugees. It was only with the dedication and persistence of U.S. negotiators present in Dayton that this accord was brought to fruition.

While everyone seems to agree that the administration deserves a great deal of credit for the success at the bargaining table, some question whether the United States should send troops to monitor and implement the agreement. This is obviously a very serious question, and we have an obligation in this Chamber to think through the implications of that decision.

The question arises, what are the United States national interests that are at stake in Bosnia? The President addressed that issue in his speech to the Nation on November 27. At that time, he made the case as to why this agreement serves America's interests, reflects American values, and requires American leadership.

There are many arguments that can be made about the ways that this agreement serves U.S. interests. For instance, that it will prevent the war from spreading in a way that might lead to a much more costly and dangerous American involvement; that it will return peace and stability to a continent that is key to our economic and military security; and that it reflects the United States moral and humanitarian interest in seeing an end to the bloodshed and violence.

All of these are very important considerations which should be weighed heavily.

Furthermore, choices are not always a matter of what is the best theoretical option but what are the courses of action available to us at any particular moment in time. Right now, we have to decide between backing the peace agreement, which we were instrumental in developing with the undertaking of a U.S. military presence, or not taking part in the NATO endeavor, which would mean no NATO endeavor and the breakdown of the peace agreement.

Viewing it from that perspective, I come to the conclusion that the risks of missing this opportunity for peace are greater, significantly greater than the risks of implementing it, although that course certainly has its dangers. Let me discuss briefly the potential consequences of not carrying through on the peace agreement.

First, I think the administration is correct in the view that without a commitment of American troops as part of a NATO force, the peace agreement will not stand. Having helped the parties to reach this point, the United States would completely undermine their confidence in the agreement and their commitment to implement it if we do not participate. Should this happen, United States troops might well be called upon to evacuate United Nations protection forces in Bosnia, under much more dangerous circumstances than our troops will face under this agreement.

Second, it could seriously erode America's diplomatic strength. Our success at conflict resolution is due not just to the skill and determination of our negotiators but also to the perception that the United States has the ability and the will to back up the agreements it makes. This is not to say that the U.S. must contribute forces to every peace agreement it helps to negotiate. But in this instance, the U.S. undertaking was a major reason the agreement was reached.

Our decision on Bosnia, therefore, could have long-lasting implications for the future of American leadership. It would be a major blow to U.S. world leadership if our failure to participate in this instance undermined our ability to move the world in a peaceful direction in other crises that might arise.

Third, it is imperative that a very clear distinction be made between this operation and Operation Desert Storm, to which analogies have been drawn. Let us remember that in the Iraqi situation the question was whether to go to war—whether to undertake a military operation to drive the Iraqi Army out of Kuwait. Here we are talking about helping to implement a peace at the invitation of all the parties to the conflict. That is not to say there are no dangers involved, nor that the mission will be easy. But there is a major difference between going in to fight a war and going in to implement a peace.

Finally, Mr. President, the choices before us are difficult ones. We have no assurances that, even with the participation of U.S. troops, the peace in Bosnia will be successful in the long run. But it is clear now that without our participation there will be no peace. The parties to the peace accord have made it plain that their confidence in a fair and evenhanded implementation of the agreement depends largely on American leadership and on American participation in the peacekeeping force.

Mr. President, consistent with our values and interests, we should exercise our leadership by supporting this opportunity for peace.

Mrs. HUTCHISON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I would like to be notified when I have reached 6 minutes, if I reach that point.

Mr. President, I was not a Member of the Senate when the debate occurred on Desert Storm, but I was nevertheless glued to the television watching every single person, back and forth across the aisle, talking about their vote of conscience. I thought it was the Senate's finest hour. Now I find myself in the position of making a similar vote. Although we are not going to an actual war, we are nevertheless voting whether to send our troops into hostilities where the President says we can expect casualties.

I feel so strongly, Mr. President, that this is the wrong decision. I feel that it is the wrong decision and that the price that we might have to pay for the mistake is too high. The cost of an American life is too high a price to support an erroneous decision.

I do not like not supporting the President in a foreign policy matter. I think we should bend over backward to do that. But I look at two things. I look at my responsibility as a Member of Congress not to rubberstamp the President in the matter of going to war, and I cannot do what I think is wrong when I also believe that we could have a small loss of face now to save a bigger disaster in the future.

We may lose a little face because we do something different from the actual commitment the President made. The President committed to 20,000 troops on the ground for this peace agreement.

There were other things the President could have offered to help the people of Bosnia keep a peace agreement. Arming and training the Moslems is the right thing to do. Although I cannot support the Dole-McCain amendment, I do think they are right in insisting that the arming and training of the Moslems happen; that it is consistent with this Senate's vote time after time after time over the last 2 years to lift the arms embargo, because anyone who has been there, as I have been, believes that there will not be stability in that part of the world until the three warring parties have some parity. That is what will keep the factions from going after each other in the future.

So arming and training the Moslems could have been done without our having troops on the ground. That would have been a fair division with our allies, and it would have fulfilled the responsibilities of the United States. But that is not what the President did. The President said we will have troops on the ground. He raised the expectations, and now we are voting whether to support that decision.

I wish to refer to an article that was written last month by James Webb, a former Assistant Secretary of Defense in the former administration, the Bush administration. And he talks about the need for strategic thinking, to determine exactly what our treaty commitments are as we go into the post-cold-war era.

And he says: ''It is time that the United States had a global strategy before it puts out any more fires.''

That really sums it up. We are running around the world putting out fires at the cost of billions of defense dollars and possibly hurting our long-term readiness for the future.

What he said we should be doing is absolutely correct. We should have a set of principles from which we react to crises.

''President Nixon,'' he quotes, ''was the last President that set out a military policy, and it was fairly simple: Honor all treaty commitments in responding to those who invade the lands of our allies.''

We have a NATO Treaty. If one of the NATO countries is invaded, we would be obligated under that treaty to respond.

This mission has expanded far beyond the NATO Treaty into a civil war in a non-NATO country, and yet we are being told NATO will fall if we do not come through with troops on the ground. It does not hold water, and it does not adhere to that very good and sound principle.

The second principle: Provide a nuclear umbrella to the world against the threats of other nuclear powers.

Mr. President, you know that we have debated theater missile defense on this very floor within the last month, and it has been a bone of contention. I strongly favor the theater missile defense.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has used her 6 minutes.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, at the end of 4 minutes, I would like to be notified once again.

We must provide the theater missile defense that gives us the umbrella to defend ourselves from the 16 countries that now have ballistic missile capabilities. But sending troops into Bosnia is going to take $5 billion from our defense readiness and from the capability to provide that kind of technology in the future.

The third tenet set out is to provide weapons and technical assistance to other countries where warranted but do not commit American forces to local conflicts. And that is exactly what we are doing. These are principles of a superpower. These are principles that keep the United States strong and uses our force when it is really necessary to keep a threat to the security of our country from happening.

Sending troops into Bosnia does not meet any of the tests of good, sound principles for our country, and we must make this President understand that there are many of us in Congress who do not believe he is within his power to go without consulting and asking the authorization of Congress to commit 20,000 troops on the ground. That is why we must a adopt the resolution or get a good vote. I do not know that it will be adopted. But I hope that there is a strong vote that tells the President that we need to sit down and have a strategy and there is a difference between a U.S. security interest in which we would put American troops in harm's way.

We all want to help the Bosnian people, and we can do it in many ways. But troops on the ground, American lives at risk is not the right way.

Mr. President, finally, it has been said several times on the floor that somehow it would not be supporting the troops to adopt the Hutchison–Inhofe resolution. It is very clear. The resolution is simple. Section 1 says:

> The Congress opposes President Clinton's decision to deploy United States military ground forces into Bosnia.

The second section says:

> The Congress strongly supports the United States military personnel who may be ordered by the President to implement the peace framework.

We are supporting the troops. I think every Member of the U.S. Senate intends to support the troops. We are going about it in different ways. I believe supporting the troops is narrowing the mission, is saying this is a mistake and, therefore, let us put a time limit on it, and if you would consider changing your mind, that would be the best of all worlds. This is a dangerous mission, and we hope the President will have every opportunity to reconsider this decision before it is too late.

That is why we believe this resolution should be adopted to support the troops by protecting them. Others may legitimately differ in passing the Dole resolution. Either way, we must support the troops, and I hope that we will adopt the resolution that opposes the President so that he will bring those troops home before the mass deployment occurs.

Thank you, Mr. President, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, once again, this body is discussing the difficult issue of U.S. policy toward Bosnia. I regret that we are still here wrestling with this issue. I regret that American troops are on their way to Bosnia. I regret that peace has yet to come to the former Yugoslavia.

Americans have watched while some of the greatest atrocities since World War II have been committed in Europe. We have watched in despair as brutal strife has sundered families, neighborhoods, towns and cities, and the peoples of an entire region. We have recoiled in horror at the summary executions of draft-age-men, the rape and murder of women and children, and discoveries of mass graves. An inhumanity which we thought long behind us has resurfaced with a shattering savagery.

It did not have to come to this. Ever since my first trip to the former Yugoslavia in August 1992, I have been convinced that the U.N. or NATO needed to take a more aggressive role in enforcing U.N. mandates, protecting U.N. personnel and at certain critical moments, reducing Serb military capabilities through selective aerial bombing. Yet, as we all know, international reluctance to take bold action, lack of consensus within NATO and the U.N. and political caution in Europe and the U.S. doomed any timely efforts to bring peace to the region.

I have also advocated lifting the arms embargo against Bosnia for several years. to me it is unconscionable that we would prevent Bosnia from defending itself against a vastly superior force, while at the same time refusing to step in, or allowing others to step in, and stop ethnic cleansing and the perpetuation of horrible atrocities against the Bosnian people. This proved to be a disastrous policy with tragic consequences. The only viable option seemed to me to be to lift the arms embargo on Bosnia.

Over the last year, we have watched the European community struggle once again to find a solution to this seemingly intractable problem. But, as with past efforts, they fell apart in spite of strong U.S. support. It became clear to all involved that the only hope of ending this tragedy was to have the U.S. take the lead in facilitating negotiations between the parties. A belated but herculean effort by the Clinton administration resulted in the Dayton discussions, and the personal commitment of both the President and Secretary Christopher helped bring the parties together at last. I applaud the administration's intense efforts and believe the Dayton agreement provides the proper framework for a viable peace if all parties to the agreement are committed to working for peace.

I continue to be reluctant to see U.S. ground troops sent to Bosnia. Just as we took the lead in Haiti, I believe the Europeans should take the lead in the implementation of the Dayton agreement, particularly in providing ground troops. The U.S. has been providing air cover and surveillance for the past few years. And we provided much of the firepower when the U.N. decided it would allow aggressive action against certain targets. I approved of these actions and believe we should continue to play that role in the Dayton agreement implementation force. I do not think that U.S. leadership at the bargaining table required us to assume responsibility for providing one-third of all ground troops.

But the President made this commitment, and the option now before Congress is to support him at this stage in the process or perhaps precipitate the collapse of the most promising chance for peace. Given circumstances that we now cannot change, I do not believe there is really a choice here. If we care about the moral principles on which this Nation is built, if we care about the stability of Europe, for which we gave so many lives in two world wars, and if we take seriously the full responsibility of world leadership, then we must act to support the President's commitment. He should have come to Congress earlier in the process. But he didn't, and this is not the time to debate that issue further.

I am opposing the Hutchison resolution because I do not think anything productive comes from saying now that we oppose the commitment of U.S. troops. The time for such a statement has long passed. And stated in isolation from any constructive discussion about what our role should be, I feel this approach is not helpful to resolving the tragedy of Bosnia.

I will support the Dole resolution, because I believe it moves us in the right direction. I do this with reluctance on one point, however. This resolution calls on the United States to lead an immediate international effort to provide equipment, arms and training to the Bosnian Government Forces. I appreciate that this is seen as a way of

addressing the military imbalance that now exists between the parties. Obviously, rough military parity is a critical requirement for a successful NATO troop withdrawal. But I believe that balance ought to be achieved by bringing down the level and sophistication of arms in the region—not by raising it. Part of the problem in achieving peace and now enforcing it is that there are too many weapons in the region.

I am very concerned that focusing our efforts on arming the Bosnian Government instead of working to disarm and curtail arms flows into the area will merely stoke the fires for another explosion in Bosnia after we leave. What good is rough parity if all it does is set the stage for a resumption of the conflict after the withdrawal of the international force?

After speaking today with Strobe Talbott, Acting Secretary of State, and Admiral Owens, Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, I am reassured that the administration is aware of the dangers of arming of the region and that every effort is being made to draw down the quantity of arms in the region, not to build them up. I also understand that General Shalikashvili is acutely aware of the potential danger to United States troops of direct United States involvement in arming, equipping, and training of the Bosnian Government Forces.

Tomorrow the President will witness the formal signing in Paris of the Dayton agreement. It is crucial to American credibility that the U.S. Senate go on record supporting his efforts prior to that time. I have received assurances that one area that will receive intense scrutiny in the coming weeks is this critical question of military balance. The Dole resolution requests a plan from the administration in 30 days. And it is critical to the safety of our troops that this issue be successfully resolved in that time frame. Therefore, I will cast my vote today to advance this process—to Paris and the signing of an accord—with the support of the U.S. Senate.

Finally, let me say that none of this would be possible without the professionalism, dedication, and commitment of the U.S. Armed Forces. The men and women who voluntarily serve under the Commander in Chief and who are now leaving their homes and families for a dangerous mission just before the holidays are the ones who make it possible to bring this hope of peace to Bosnia. We owe them a tremendous debt of gratitude and our hearts are with them. For it is they who put a face on what America stands for, and who are willing to take risks to see that others who want to live by these ideals are given a chance.

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I am a cosponsor of the Hutchison-Inhofe resolution in opposition to the Clinton administration's decision to send troops to Bosnia as part of the NATO Implementation Force, known as IFOR. I commend the Senators from Texas and Oklahoma and the other cosponsors of this resolution for their efforts in bringing it to the Senate floor. The resolution is brief, simple and to the point. It states: ''Congress opposes President Clinton's decision to deploy United States military ground forces into the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina to implement the General Framework Agreement for Peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina and its associated annexes.''

Further, the resolution also states: ''Congress strongly supports the United States military personnel who may be ordered by the President to implement the General Framework Agreement for Peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina and its associated annexes.''

That is it. This resolution is the people's resolution, because it accurately reflects the views of the vast majority of the American people. Most Americans oppose sending our brave soldiers to Bosnia. And far more agree that, if the President insists on deployment, we must stand by our troops. Though we may disagree with our President, we must not do so in a way that would put the lives of American soldiers in Bosnia needlessly at risk.

Mr. President, debate on the use of United States troops should not be put in terms of whether we support a peace agreement in Bosnia. We all want peace. No one disagrees with that. Few deserve the chance for peace and stability more than the families in Bosnia and Herzegovina. What we have witnessed in the Balkans these past few years has been nothing less than tragic.

To his credit, the President has tried to achieve a negotiated peace framework. However, I am afraid that this peace agreement is fatally flawed in several respects. First, a large number of those responsible for the atrocities—a level of mass slaughter unequaled since Hitler and Stalin—likely will go unpunished.

Second, the agreement assumes continued cooperation between the Croatia and Bosnian Moslem leadership. That is a dangerous assumption. The fact is the Bosnian Moslems and the Croats often have been on opposing sides of this regional conflict. In fact, 2 years ago, Croat forces were launching attacks on Moslems in Mostar and the surrounding townships.

This peace agreement and the President's plan to enforce it fly in the face of history that dates back far longer than the last few years. The recent atrocities we have witnessed are an intensification of a conflict that dates back at least five centuries. This is a regional civil war. This is a civil war rooted in ethnic and religious differences. This is a civil war older than our own country. And at no time in our history has this civil war represented a national security threat to the United States. It was not a national security threat then. It is not one now.

Finally, Mr. President, this is a flawed agreement because it does not have the support of many in the affected regions. In the last few weeks, Bosnian Serbs in Sarajevo have made it very clear they will not support this agreement and allow for Moslem control of Sarajevo. The resolve of the rank and file in Sarajevo to stand their ground brings images and lessons to mind—of Beirut, Lebanon; Mogadishu, Somalia; and from my personal experience, of countless towns and villages in Vietnam.

Mr. President, our troops represent the finest, best trained military force on the planet. The fact is 20,000 of our finest soldiers cannot erase 500 years of hatred and bloodshed. Peace will not come from the resolve of American soldiers. Peace must come and must last from the resolve of the Bosnians, the Croats, and the Serbians to say and believe that more than five centuries of conflict is enough.

In fact, the injection of foreign troops into a civil war would only work to prolong the conflict in the long term. Our own Civil War would have lasted far longer and been far more devastating had Europe intervened. That was why President Lincoln worked tirelessly to prevent Europe's involvement. Though we will never know for certain, I believe Lincoln's efforts and Europe's decision not to intervene ultimately saved lives—American and European. Similarly, in the long run, I believe we could save more lives—American and European—by pursuing other means to achieve a lasting peace other than the limited deployment of IFOR.

Mr. President, I know what it is like to serve my country in a mission that did not have the clear support of the American people. I am a Vietnam veteran, a former second lieutenant in the United States Army. I am proud to have served my country in Vietnam. However, it was my hope that this Nation learned a few lessons—lessons that would make clear that sending troops to Bosnia is a serious mistake.

It is my hope that the President will reconsider his decision to deploy United States troops to Bosnia. However, my fondest wishes and current reality are worlds apart. The President has demonstrated his resolve to defy the wishes of the American people and the clear history of the region and put our troops in harm's way. That being the case, and once the troops are deployed, it is my hope that we in Congress will not do anything to jeopardize the safety of our troops. However, that should not deter us from closely monitoring the situation in Bosnia, just as we did in Somalia, and just as we did in Haiti. I intend to do so. The people of South Dakota, especially the families of the soldiers who may be deployed there, deserve no less.

Finally, my thoughts and prayers are with the brave young men and women who have been called to serve in or in support of the Bosnia mission, as well as their families and friends. I know this is a very difficult time. I know

what it is like to tell family members that I will be serving my country in a conflict half a world away. And now I know what it is like to learn that a member of my own family has been called to serve. My nephew Steve Pressler, son of my brother Dan and his wife Marcia, has been called to duty as part of an eight-member South Dakota National Guard unit that has been put on alert. It truly brings the matter home, both for my family and the other families with members who have been called to duty.

Again, Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to support the Hutchison resolution—the people's resolution. The President needs to understand that, as the people's representatives, we support the well-being of our troops, but we cannot support a policy that puts the lives of our troops on the line without a clear national security purpose. The policy is wrong. Our troops should not go.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, I rise today to say to my colleagues that President Clinton's decision to send United States troops to monitor the peace in Bosnia should not be a partisan issue. The President has decided to send American troops on a NATO peacekeeping mission in Bosnia; as Commander in Chief, the Constitution empowers him to do so. President Reagan exercised this power to send troops to Lebanon and Grenada; President Bush used this power to send troops to Panama and the Persian Gulf. As a newly elected Member of the United States Senate, I supported President Bush in sending troops to Panama, and I was 1 of 11 Democrats to vote for a resolution in support of Operation Desert Storm. I intend to support President Clinton as well, notwithstanding any reservations I may have about sending troops to Bosnia.

I do have serious misgivings about the deployment of American ground troops in the Balkan region; I wish that the President had not committed them. This is a high-risk mission, and the American people need to understand, as the President has stated, that casualties are almost inevitable. Some months ago I supported lifting the arms embargo, an embargo which prevented the Bosnian Moslems from securing the weapons necessary to defend themselves. Unfortunately, that embargo was never lifted. If it has been lifted, the Bosnian Moslems would have had the weapons they needed and American forces may never have been deployed.

I have two primary apprehensions about the assignment of troops to Bosnia; I am concerned that the mission need to be adequately defined, and I am concerned about the details of the United States exit strategy. As a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, I have had the opportunity to question closely Secretary of Defense Perry and Joint Chiefs of Staff Chairman General Shalikashvili when they appeared before the committee. They have assured me that the mission is narrowly defined and is confined to (a) the marking of the cease-fire line, inter-entity boundary line, and zones of separation, and (b) the monitoring and enforcement of the withdrawal of forces to their respective territories within the agreed period. With this mission so narrowly defined, I believe that we can avoid problems with mission creep we have faced in the past where troops have been committed without careful thought to what the goals of the mission were. Somalia is a case in point. Both Secretary Perry and General Shalikashvili are convinced that the Bosnia mission can be accomplished in 1 year. Furthermore, U.S. troops are not going to be responsible for nation-building, refugee relocation, or other humanitarian activities. They have also assured me that the decision to leave the region will be up to the United States and the United States alone, and other NATO countries have pledged to follow our lead.

I believe the United States has played a critical role in this peace process. Without U.S. diplomatic involvement, the peace talks in Dayton would never have come about. Without the United States, this bloody war may never have ended. We have brought the Balkan peace process along this far, it would be terribly disingenuous for us to bail out now. The President has encouraged our allies to support this mission and all NATO countries with troops have pledged their support. It would be a tragedy for the United States to let the NATO countries down now, especially since we have done so much to promote peace in Bosnia.

The Congress has taken responsibility in this process as well. We sought to define the mission and a bipartisan congressional coalition has worked to insure that the mission is strongly defined and the exit strategy is clarified. We have an obligation to insure that the mission can be successfully executed. We know that the U.S. uniformed services are the best in the world, and we should stand proudly behind them.

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I rise today to oppose President Clinton's plan to send America's sons and daughters into Bosnia. On Monday evening, President Clinton asked Congress and the American people to support a policy that transforms the world's greatest fighting force into a band of peace enforcers and nation builders.

Unfortunately, this President is a poor student of history. He has quickly forgotten the tragic lessons of Somalia and Beirut. I can assure you, Mr. President, the families of those killed in those faraway places are reminded every day and will not soon forget the consequences of this type of ill-conceived foreign policy.

President Clinton wants us to support an undetermined scheme to enforce a precarious peace between factions that have been at war for almost 4 years and fighting each other for generations. He tells us it will take 20,000 American troops and less than a year. Mr. President, less than a year to bring peace to a place that has not known peace in recent memory?

President Clinton tells us that our troops will be peacekeepers and not war fighters. They will be neutral brokers of an agreed upon settlement between warring parties. The problem with this, Mr. President, is that we are not a neutral party in this conflict. President Clinton himself admits that we chose sides.

We imposed economic sanctions on Serbia and were an active participant in a sustained air assault on Bosnian Serb targets. To add insult to injury, the administration also proposes that we train the Bosnian Federation while we enforce the peace. Is there any doubt that the Serbs will view our presence as something less than neutral?

Mr. President, why is this any different than Beirut or Somalia and can we really expect a different result?

President Clinton said that we will send 20,000 of our troops. How did he determine that we would need 20,000 troops to enforce the peace?

Earlier this year President Clinton imprudently promised to commit up to 25,000 U.S. ground forces long before there was peace, before there was a plan, before there was a mission, and before we had any idea whether it would be necessary to become involved at all. Recently, the President told us that he still has not seen the plan.

As yet, there is no clearly defined mission, no attainable military goals and no way to measure success. However, President Clinton knows that we will send 20,000 of our troops to implement this unknown plan. Mr. President, without well-defined and achievable military goals, I fear that the world's finest fighting forces are about to be used as global hall-monitors, sitting ducks for disgruntled belligerents.

Mr. President, I suggest that the administration has yet to establish any credible case for this deployment.

President Clinton also tells us that the United States must lead when NATO is involved. Of course the United States must lead, but the President has equated leadership with American ground troops.

American ground forces offer no tactical or operational advantage to a Bosnian peace force. They offer only political advantage for our reluctant European allies. The Balkans are historically a matter of concern to Western Europe. If they do not believe the problem is important enough to solve—then we certainly should not.

President Clinton apparently believes that the United States must deploy troops in Bosnia to preserve NATO and that NATO is the proper vehicle for peace in Bosnia. Mr. President, by any measure this would greatly expand the alliance's mandate to include missions never even remotely contemplated by NATO's founders.

NATO was intended to be a military alliance to deter a Soviet attack on Western Europe. There is no doubt that the United States has a vital interest in the continent's security. President Clinton proposes, however, that we transform the basic mission of NATO from an organization that guards Western Europe from attack, into an organization that intervenes in civil disputes and parochial conflicts of nonmember states.

Mr. President, we should never seek to preserve an alliance unless that alliance serves the purposes for which it was crated. NATO was not created to be the arbiter of civil disputes nor should it seek to become one.

What did President Clinton not tell us? He did not tell us how our troops will get out. He told us that it should last only 1 year, but as former Assistant Secretary of Defense Richard Perle testified before the Armed Services Committee, ''An exit date is not an exit strategy.'' To compound the problem, the administration will be under enormous pressure to succeed. Especially in an election year.

Without clearly defined military missions and goals, mission creep is inevitable. As President Clinton expands the mission he will be compelled to escalate American military efforts to meet the requirements of new missions. This sounds very familiar, Mr. President.

President Clinton also did not tell the American people how much this will cost them. Some estimates run as high as $2 billion and that is based on a best-case scenario. Mr. President, military planning must take into account the worst-case scenario. Our fighting forces must be prepared for any contingency.

Again, I fear that this administration has not prepared for unexpected events which are inevitable in any military operation. This could be critical not only to the financial cost of the operation, but to the incalculable human cost as well.

President Clinton asked the American people to choose peace. Mr. President, the American people do choose peace. We hope for a lasting end to the Bosnian civil war that has raged for so long. The American people and this body will support the President in his efforts to end the fighting, but we will not commit our fighting men and women when we have no vital national interest at stake. Just saying we have a vital interest, Mr. President, does not make it so. President Clinton has failed to make the case to the American people, and this body should not support a deployment of American troops to Bosnia.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I have serious concerns about the deployment of American troops in Bosnia. I certainly have concerns about the stability of the peace accord reached in Dayton. I have concerns about the potential disruption that Bosnian Serbs and other antipeace factions of the various affected parties may create. And I have no illusions about the vulnerability of Americans—our Nation's men and women who will be part of the Peace Implementation Force in Bosnia—to innumerable dangers as a result of this deployment. But leadership is not risk-free, Mr. President.

It is clear that even as we are debating this issue, United States troops are participating in the NATO effort to implement the Bosnia peace agreement. Every nation in Europe—in Western Europe and Eastern Europe, even Russia—is deploying troops as part of the peace accord. The achievements that were reached after painstaking negotiations between Bosnian President Alija Izetbegovic, Croatian President Franjo Tudjman, and Serbian President Slobodan Milosevic with support and facilitation by United States representatives, particularly Secretary of State Christopher and Assistant Secretary of State Richard Holbrooke, have generated the best chance yet of achieving a stable outcome for the Baltic region. It is clear that U.S. support of this NATO effort is essential if we are to maintain our leadership role in the world, and if the peace enforcement effort is to succeed.

The November 21 peace agreement calls for the creation of a 60,000 member implementation force [I-FOR], which will be comprised of 30 countries. I-FOR's mission is not to side with the combatants, but is rather to monitor and enforce compliance with the military aspects of the settlement. I have listened carefully to testimony from defense and foreign policy experts on the use of military forces to enforce a peace regime. None of them has identified this as an easy mission and all have concerns. While I feel there are many risks which may potentially disrupt NATO's efforts to secure peace in the region, I agree with former National Security Advisor Brent Scowcroft that ''disaster is certain if the U.S. backs out of the situation now.''

Mr. President, I do not support an open-ended time frame to maintaining peace indefinitely in the region. I think that the debates this Chamber has had, the testimony that has been provided to the Senate Armed Services Committee, and the dialog that many here have had with the President and Secretary Perry have underscored the critical significance of limiting the scope of our mission in Bosnia. I am confident that the President is committed to the 1-year time frame and is committed to the limited objectives he has presented—namely, separating the parties and maintaining the cease-fire. And I have been assured that those who attack our forces or impede this process will be dealt with swiftly and decisively.

Mr. President, our troops are on the ground today in Bosnia; we are there, and we need to support our men and women. Congress should not withhold funds that are needed to support our troops, and we should not tie the President's hands during this time when American leadership matters so very much. My vote is to approve of U.S. participation in the NATO initiative.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, what the Senate is faced with amounts to a shotgun wedding. The Congress and American troops find themselves confronting an unfortunate mistake, but one which we are now obliged to make the best of. Our decision—each Senator's choice—is whether we respond to the situation with a sense of honor and accountability or whether we abandon our principles and responsibility.

I am not happy with our choice. I don't think any one of us welcomes the prospect of sending American soldiers into Bosnia. I share the Majority Leader's view that we would not have been presented with this decision if the administration had worked as methodically to lift the embargo on Bosnia as it did to advance the deal in Dayton. But, at this stage it matters less how we got here—it is of far graver consequence how we proceed.

Why should we look forward and not back?

Because we do not have the option or choice to change the course of events. The agreement has been signed, now we must decide what kind of mission we will carry out and how we will assure it succeeds.

We are now presented with two unambiguous facts—the first being that the Dayton agreement would not have been reached without aggressive, rational U.S. leadership. This is not, after all the Tashkent Treaty. Leaders from many other nations have tried repeatedly to negotiate a settlement, but it was largely American diplomatic efforts which produced results.

And, just as the U.S. role meant the difference between a settlement and continued blood shed, so too, the immediate parties to the agreement and our allies in Europe believe we have a unique authority and capability to guarantee the accord's successful implementation.

But, the second fact is more important and that is that the President of the United States has made the commitment to deploy 20,000 Americans in support of a NATO Implementation Force to secure the accord. Whether we like it or not, those troops are going, indeed some are on the ground. To deny our support for Operation Joint Endeavor, flatly repudiates our long standing NATO security obligations and undermines our troops committed to the effort.

The credibility of American leadership and American treaty commitments are the interests which are very much at stake if we now fail to fulfill the President's decision. Just after the President's Oval Office address, Henry Kissinger observed, ''if we do not honor the President's words, the threat to our security would be greater because nobody would believe we are capable of conducting serious foreign policy.''

President Bush, who so capably led this country beyond deep anxieties about committing our Nation to war in the Persian Gulf echoed that sentiment. He pointed out, ''If it is seen that the President does not have the support of the Congress—our standing as leader of the free world and the standing of NATO would be dramatically diminished. That must not happen.''

Now, we must make certain that our troops have the means to succeed. We must guarantee they are assured every conceivable operational advantage and the unqualified support of both the public and Congress.

Mr. President, I do not believe this Nation is by nature indifferent to international concerns—there is no inherent isolationist point of view. But the public is clearly troubled by this decision—they now seem at best divided and at worst deeply opposed to the President's decision.

I attribute the confusion to 3 years of flip flops, reversals, and irrational foreign policy inconsistent with our national interests. The public has little reason to believe that this time the administration will stay on track with a limited mission that protects our Nation's interests and our soldiers lives.

That is why I think it is incumbent on Congress to assure absolute accountability regarding the scope of the mission, the costs and the strategy for withdrawing our forces. We have a clear and compelling responsibility to the troops we are deploying to guarantee they are well equipped and are carrying out limited, achievable goals.

Unfortunately, there are already contradictions and uncertainties emerging which will only plague the administration's desire to strengthen public support. Last week, Secretary Perry testified before the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee that our financial burden would be limited to support for our troops. Within a matter of days, the Defense Department submitted a letter notifying Congress of the possibility of transferring $300 million in defense articles and services to nations participating in I-For. Apparently, DOD anticipates reimbursement for this support, but those of us who monitor the United Nations have serious reservations about the reliability of these promissory notes.

The administration cannot afford to allow any ambiguity to creep into the public debate about the scope of our responsibilities. One of the reasons I support the resolution drafted by the leader is the requirement that the administration provide a full accounting of the mission, rules of engagement, command arrangements, goals, compliance with the agreements and all costs to all agencies involved in this endeavor. The leader's resolution is the best protection our troops have that their government will not fail them as they carry out their duties with skill and honor.

But, the real key to success and the heart of my support for the Leadership resolution is the requirement that the United States lead an immediate effort to provide equipment, arms, training and related logistics to enable Bosnia to provide for its own defense.

Mr. President, I do not think it is wise to establish an arbitrary date for the exit of American troops. That only guarantees a cooling off period before fighting resumes. We have seen the destructive consequences of just such an approach in Somalia. Knowing our departure was imminent, the warlords bided their time. Somalia today is indistinguishable from the chaos and anarchy which preceded our arrival.

That must not happen in the Balkans.

Our mission can only be deemed a success if we contribute to a durable solution, securing a lasting regional stability and peace. Stability and peace demand a military balance between the Serbs and the Bosnian-Croat Federation.

I realize that there are members with major misgivings about the possible consequences of lifting the embargo and arming and training the Bosnians. They want to allow the so called arms build down process to have time to take affect. Unfortunately, there are far too many unanswered questions about the arms reduction program to risk Bosnia's freedom and long term prospects for stability.

At this point it is entirely unclear who will assume the responsibility for enforcing arms control. As the Dayton agreement is constructed, the immediate reach of the disarmament regime is limited to the NATO patrolled cease-fire zones of separation. This makes obvious sense for the security of our soldiers, but offers no iron clad guarantees for the reduction of massive Serb stockpiles within the boundaries of Bosnia-Herzegovina.

Let me add one final historical observation on arming the Bosnians. I think a majority of members in this chamber would share the view that it was not SALT or START agreements which brought about the demise of the Soviet Union. Arms control initiatives may reduce risks, but any level headed assessment of the Cold War reaches the conclusion that it was the credibility of our military power which guaranteed our security and global stability. So too, in the Balkans—only a credible military balance will minimize the risk of the war reigniting.

Mr. President, in 1990 the American public was ambivalent about the notion of sending Americans to war in the gulf. We all know just how close the vote was in the Senate.

From a parochial perspective, 20,000 soldiers deployed from Kentucky—if my memory serves me it was the largest contingent from any State. George Bush faced formidable opposition from families in Kentucky, but he was able to overcome their concerns by exercising leadership. In the words of his Secretary of State, ''The U.S. had in George Bush a leader who was consistent, principled, decisive and strong.''

Those have not been the words most of the members of this chamber would use to describe the President's record in foreign policy so far. I think it is worth noting very few Kentuckians have been called up for deployment in Bosnia—a handful compared to the gulf. Yet, there is more pronounced, stronger opposition to the President's decision to deploy U.S. troops to secure peace than there was to Bush's decision to wage war.

President Clinton has made the decision to deploy American troops to end the suffering, stop the war from spreading, and to build a Europe at peace. He has argued that this can only be achieved if the United States continues to lead. I take this pledge seriously.

Congress and American troops now stand at an altar—let us all hope and work to assure that it is not one which involves the unnecessary sacrifice of American lives. But as we proceed, let us share the understanding that there are crucial U.S. interests at stake. The lives of American soldiers and the credibility of American leadership and our security commitments to NATO now hang precariously in the balance. We must speak with one voice and honor the President's pledge.

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, the role of the United States in the world is unique. America has played a historic role in opposing tyranny, and giving hope to people denied their freedom. Similarly, our military has played a central and unparalleled role in the world. Only the U.S. Armed Forces combine the ability to achieve enormous and complicated military objectives with the commitment to use this force in pursuit of the values that made our Nation great—freedom, justice, democracy, and the protection of basic human rights.

Despite a great deal of theorizing about the so-called new world order, our role in the world should remain the same as it was throughout the cold war. Certainly, our interests remain the same. Even when not pitted against the Soviet Union and its Communist expansionism we can identify our interests clearly.

In Bosnia, they were deterrence of aggression, support for the right of self defense, abhorrence of ethnic cleansing, and support for multi-ethnic democracy. President Clinton's 1992 campaign emphasized all of these issues. His policy as President has reflected none of them.

Since early on in the conflict, I supported lifting the embargo on the Bosnian Government and helping the Bosnian people to defend themselves. In my view this was required on moral grounds. It was also the strategically and militarily sound course. But most of all, it was based on the right of individuals and nations to defend their freedom.

The embargo condemned the people of Bosnia to a slow death, carried out not only by military engagements but also by savage attacks on civilians.

Serbia came to the war with a massive advantage in arms and throughout the war was able to acquire the arms it needed from other sources. The Bosnian Government's forces were at an extreme disadvantage. Aligning the United States with the embargo and the denial of Bosnia's right of self-defense was a disgrace. If this administration had pursued a policy of lifting the arms embargo and allowing the Bosnians to defend themselves, negotiations would have been conducted from a position of strength and U.S. troops would not have been required.

Instead, this administration favored negotiation, compromise, and concession even when it was painfully obvious that only the threat of force and the willingness to use it by the Bosnians would allow any hope of democracy and freedom in Bosnia.

Ironically, the President now has found a use for force, not to promote freedom, but to try to enforce an unjust agreement. President Clinton has committed U.S. troops and credibility to implement an agreement which, as this resolution says, ''ratifies the results of ethnic cleansing and territorial aggression.''

This agreement is the inevitable result of the administration's policy of refusing to allow the Bosnian Government to defend itself and—let's be frank—its sentences the people of Bosnia to a peace of subservience and domination.

Peace has many forms. There is the so-called peace of the former Soviet bloc where the ever present threat of force subjugated the nations of Eastern and Central Europe. Bosnia and the countries of the former Yugoslavia were supposed to have escaped that domination. Instead, another venal and dangerous threat arose.

In the former Yugoslavia, the threat was complicated by historical rivalries and ethnic and religious differences. The administration seized on the complexity of the situation and used it as an excuse to do nothing. ''There are no good guys,'' the administration said. Or ''it's a civil war.''

The peace being imposed on the people of Bosnia is the peace of domination and fear. Unless the Bosnian Government is given the means to defend itself now, we can expect that the war will continue.

We should not be in this position. It was avoidable. However, the decision to commit U.S. troops and prestige has been made by the President in his constitutionally prescribed role as Commander-in-Chief.

The Congressional role in providing funds for military operations is also set forth in the Constitution. Congress could exercise its constitutional power to deny the funds to carry out this or any other military mission. The President would certainly veto such a measure. Without the votes to override, ultimately, he would prevail.

Nothing would be served by undercutting the men and women of our Armed Forces at this late date. U.S. troops have already begun arriving and more are on the way. A strong vote against the deployment would demoralize our troops and embolden those who would like to see the Dayton settlement collapse.

Congress must back our troops unconditionally and work to make certain they have everything they need to carry out their mission. If we learned anything from Somalia, it is that no corners can be cut where our troops are concerned. Their rules of engagement, their equipment, their training, everything about their mission, must be designed to remove all unnecessary risk. We can and we must achieve this for the young men and women serving their country.

This resolution allows the President to fulfill his commitment to deploy U.S. forces to implement the General Framework Agreement so long as the mission of the United States forces in Bosnia and Herzegovina is limited to enforcement of the military provisions of the Dayton Agreement, that the exit strategy includes establishment of a military balance enabling the government of Bosnia to defend itself, and that the U.S. will lead an immediate international effort to provide equipment, arms, training and related logistics assistance of the highest possible quality to the Bosnian government.

These determinations are essential. In the last few weeks, the administration has made contradictory statements about U.S. intentions to help equip and train the Bosnian Government. On the one hand, the administration said it will help train and equip the Bosnian side. On the other hand, officials have said arming the Bosnian Government forces would not be necessary because provisions in the Dayton Agreement call for negotiated arms limitation agreements.

That sends exactly the wrong signal. This war was made possible by the inability of the Bosnian Government to defend itself. Late yesterday, the President made the commitment to lead the effort to arm and train the Bosnian Government forces. In light of the administration's recent ambivalence about arming and training the Bosnian Government forces, I expect that the administration will show, starting today, concrete steps toward fulfilling this commitment to the United States Congress and to the Bosnian Government, including getting a commitment of support from our allies. The Congress expects that commitment to be kept as a condition for passing the Dole-McCain resolution.

There is very little satisfying about the peace agreement reached at Dayton. As President Izetbegovic of Bosnia said, ''this may not be a just agreement but it is more just than the continuation of war.'' That is little to go on for the people of Bosnia, but it will have to do.

Our role in brokering this settlement makes it incumbent upon us to help enforce it. Our role in the world, and the unique role our military has played as a force for freedom requires that we work to establish a military balance which will protect Bosnia from future aggression. Therefore I support our troops as they endeavor to carry out the United States military mission in Bosnia.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, as I rise to speak about American participation in enforcing the Bosnian peace agreement to be signed in Paris this week, I want to begin by making clear my firm belief that U.S. participation in this action is the wrong thing to do.

I would note here a few of the many reasons for taking this position:

The Serbs, Croats, Bosnians, and others in the region have been fighting for hundreds of years, creating generational hatreds which no ''piece of paper'' is going to stop.

There are many elements in the region, not least the Bosnian Serbs—the main belligerents—who are unhappy with this settlement and will do everything they can to upset it, including by attacking our forces.

There is no clear national interest in our involvement in this endeavor other than, to some, the preservation of our leadership in NATO.

However, the question then is: ''is this the issue upon which the future of NATO should be decided?'' I certainly hope not.

U.S. troops will be in the middle of a situation fraught with antagonism and hatred. They will have to be arbiters, for example, of who lives where, who gets trained, who is ''right'' in the inevitable thousands of disputes which will arise.

Inevitably, they'll become participants, and in that part of the world that means they'll be victims of the violence they are supposed to prevent.

The map to which the parties have agreed is a disaster and creates ungovernable nations which the parties will, long after this incident is over, inevitably begin to fight about again.

There is no realistic ''exit strategy'' because there is no likelihood that these incredibly difficult problems are going to be resolved in 1 year, 2 years, 5 years, or even 100 years.

Mr. President, there are countless other reasons why this is the wrong thing to do. My colleagues will be discussing them at great length, so there is no reason for me to note them here.

THE ISSUE OF CONGRESSIONAL AUTHORIZATION

Rather I would like to discuss another aspect of this issue.

Mr. President, eventually the constitutional issue of whether the President must have authorization from Congress to participate in such ventures will be decided in the Congress' favor.

However, in the meantime, we have a reality, a sad reality: the President can make this deployment even without congressional authorization or support.

He's going to do so without congressional authorization or even congressional support. In fact he's going to do it even if the Congress disapproves.

This is unfortunate, and I think the President will regret acting in this way at a time when the Congress and, I believe, the overwhelming majority of the American people, have serious doubts about this policy.

WE HAVE TO SUPPORT OUR TROOPS

Mr. President, that is the reality.

We in Congress have to deal as best we can with that reality—that our troops are going to Bosnia, to Croatia, to Hungary, and elsewhere in the Balkans—by doing everything in our power to support our military men and women.

In short, our forces are going into a situation with many risks, with many dangers, with the potential for many of them to be injured or killed during their tour of duty. As they do so, we have to do several things: Make sure they have rules of engagement which allow them to defend themselves and deal with threats to themselves, including by force; make sure they have sufficient back up, including support forces in the region and air support to deal with threat; and, most importantly, make sure they know that no matter what the political differences at home, they have the 100 percent support of all Americans.

In sum, Mr. President, no matter how much we oppose this policy, and no matter how the situation evolves in the Balkans, we have to be prepared to show our forces, in every way possible, that they have our full and unequivocal support.

THE FUTURE

Mr. President, let me conclude by saying that it is essential that the Congress, with its oversight responsibilities, watch very carefully how this situation evolves, how our forces are treated, and how this complex and convoluted peace agreement is implemented.

As we do so, we must be prepared to take appropriate action if what I firmly believe are the overly optimistic predictions of the administration do not come true.

That too is an absolutely essential part of our support for our troops as they face this risky, dangerous, unprecedented, and, in my view, unfortunate endeavor.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, the decision on Bosnia is extremely difficult. But I believe our responsibility is clear.

The United States is being asked to participate in a peacekeeping mission by all the parties to the dispute in Bosnia. They say that without our participation, there will be no chance for peace.

It is important to remember that we are being asked to enforce an agreed upon peace. We are not being asked to wage war.

It is in our interest to help prevent the spread of this conflict to the rest of Europe. And it is morally right to help stop the slaughter and atrocities that have repeatedly occurred.

However, I have always thought that Bosnia was primarily the European's responsibility. This conflict is in their backyard. It most directly affects their interests.

I also have serious doubts whether peace can be secured in 1 year. The history of the region is one of strife and struggle. There has been conflict in the Balkans for hundreds of years. For 45 years after World War II, the differences were suppressed by Marshal Tito. But when he passed from the scene, the old enmities resumed as violently as before.

Despite these serious doubts, I am persuaded we ought to help give the parties a chance to build the peace they say they want. They have said they are tired of war, and asked us and 25 other nations to give them the opportunity they need to try to craft a lasting peace.

Most importantly, I believe we must send a strong message of support for our troops, who are helping to create an opportunity for peace in Bosnia. Anything less will add to the risks that the brave men and women of our Armed Forces will face.

I have therefore decided to support the Dole-McCain resolution supporting our troops and limiting the mission they are expected to fulfill.

I will continue to carefully monitor our involvement to ensure that this mission does not expand beyond the limited one being authorized tonight.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I rise to express my support for the Dole-McCain resolution regarding the deployment of United States troops in Bosnia.

I would like to begin my remarks by commending the respected majority leader for his skill and leadership in this sensitive and vital area. I emphasize the word ''leader,'' because true leadership has been required here and has been much evident.

There is, I believe it is fair to say, a great amount of shared rich feeling here in the Senate about this deployment. There is a palpable feeling of trepidation about this mission, on both sides of the aisle. Few in this body are certain that sending troops is the right thing to do, and for that reason, would not have voted to do it. At the same time, there is considerable sentiment here that we should do eveything possible to fully support our troops once they are there, and to avoid any appearance of undercutting our Commander in Chief. To undercut our command structure while American troops are in harm's way is something that most Senators earnestly wish to avoid.

I believe that the Senate has plaintively wished to give voice simultaneously to these two conflicting impulses. The majority leader's initiative has made it possible for us to do so.

Turning that shared feeling into a constructive statement of policy is a tremendously difficult task. It requires not only considerable political skill and courage, but a detailed recognition of the factors confronting our forces in Bosnia, and confronting our President.

First, I do believe that there is broad agreement here about the President's constitutional authority, as Commander in Chief, to deploy U.S. forces to defend U.S. interests abroad. We in Congress do have the constitutional right and duty to be involved in fundamental decisions of war and peace. But the principal ways in which we do this are—first, to declare war ourselves, a congressional prerogative, and second, to use our power over the purse to limit the military operation pursued by the President. We do retain that power. But otherwise, we recognize that it is the President, not the Congress, who has the authority to command the Armed forces, within the limits of what Congress is willing to fund.

Earlier today, we voted as to whether to forbid the President to use DOD funds to support a deployment in Bosnia. Buy a 77 to 22 vote, we decided that we would not curtail such funding. Thus I believe that it is now incumbent upon the Congress to maximize the chances of success for the mission which the President has seen fit to initiate.

The President's decision to deploy U.S. forces is associated with his committing the United States to do its share in upholding a peace negotiated between the warring parties. I have my own grave doubts about whether this peace will hold. It may indeed hold, but I do not believe that it will hold simply because United States, British, French, or other NATO forces are present. If the warring parties in Bosnia are not satisfied with the terms of the peace, they will take out their hostilities on whichever forces are in this way. I believe that the historical record in that regard is so very clear.

It is possible that the peace will indeed hold, if an equilibrium has been reached there. If the various parties are satisfied with the territory over which they have been given jurisdiction, then there may indeed be peace. I would say, however, that there are troubling signs that this will not be the case in Bosnia. I am certain that my colleagues have read and heard about many instances of aggressive behavior in the last few days. One involved the touching of a town, by Bosnian Croats, which was slated to be turned over to the Serbs. Can we assume that these horrible actions will not meet with reprisals? Will the Serbs be satisfied that a town allotted to them under the terms of the peace agreement has been destroyed? Will vengeance not be sought at another time and place? I believe it would be highly naive to assume that these activities will cease the moment that United States troops take up their positions in Bosnia.

So it should be clear that I am most troubled by the President's decision to send troops to Bosnia. However, I would also say that we do not add to the safety of our troops by withdrawing support from our President at this

time. We know from our own tragic experience that no good comes from public disunity between the President and the Congress at such a time as this. To tell the world that America's commitment is soft, that it will be undone once the Congress can prevail over the President in such a matter, is to invite attacks upon our troops, and thereby upon our resolve. Certainly, any potential enemies will seek to test American resolve in Bosnia. ''We must not,'' I say to my colleagues, lay any of the groundwork for those detractors by making it harder for the President to stand by his decisions.

The majority leader's resolution, I believe, recognizes that our desire to support our President does not mandate that we simply offer him a blank check to proceed in Bosnia in any which way. This resolution incorporates the insights of our able Majority Leader and others as to the reality that our troops can only safely and profitably be withdrawn once Bosnia can stand on its own without resort to the presence of American support. This requires the training and equipping of aviable Bosnian army. Much of the negotiations between the Congress and the President as to the substance of this resolution have turned on this point. I am pleased to see that we have received a commitment from the White House that America will assume a leading role in training the Bosnian army there.

That is the factor which can make it possible for the President to claim this mission as a success upon its conclusion; otherwise we run the risk of simply delaying whatever bloodshed would otherwise occur until the United States withdraws. If we have simply a target date for the hostilities to resume, and we will have accomplished nothing. The work of the majority leader in this area could help to ensure that this mission is not in vain, and that a lasting peace in Bosnia is possible, without a sustained and indefinite American presence.

So I commend the resolution offered by Senator DOLE and the intrepid and courageous MCCAIN and I urge my colleagues to support it. I trust that my colleagues will agree with me that the task before us—once such a mission is undertaken—is to ensure that it has the greatest possible chance for success. I believe that in this instance, we accomplish this by defining and limiting the nature of the mission in Bosnia, and by providing a strategy leading toward the orderly withdrawal of United States troops from this part of the world. The Dole-McCain resolution surely accomplishes this, and I urge the Senate to adopt it.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, before I begin my remarks on the resolutions related to Bosnia, I would like to express my unequivocal support for the men and women of the United States Armed Forces. I can think of no greater act of patriotism and devotion to this country than to enlist in the military and devote one's professional life to the defense of our Constitution. It is made even more profound by the realization that these brave men and women do not have a say in how, or where, they will be employed. They go where they are told to go, fight where they are told to fight, and do so better than any other military force in the world. Throughout their service they must spend months, sometimes even years, away from their home and family. Children are born and start growing up while their parent is away in the service of their country. Few of us in America today realize the tremendous sacrifice these men and women make so that we may enjoy the fruits of liberty. It is time we honor their sacrifice.

But such sacrifice is not limited to our active duty forces. I have been informed that four Michigan National Guard and Army Reserve units will be deployed in support of Operation Joint Endeavor. To the officers, men and women of the 1776th Military Police Company, the 210th Military Police Headquarters and Headquarters Detachment, both from Taylor, MI, the 415th Civil Affairs Battalion in Kalamazoo, MI, and the 415th Military Intelligence Detachment in Ann Arbor, MI, I wish you God speed and a safe deployment. I have also been informed that one of my own staff, a Naval Reservist, may be recalled to active duty to support these military operations. May you all return quickly and safely. I commend your patriotism, your bravery, and your devotion to duty. You exemplify all that is worthy and noble in Michigan, in our military, and in the United States. I'm sure all my colleagues here in the Senate join me in saluting your valor.

Now Mr. President, I would like to specifically address the issue of America's interest and involvement in Bosnia. This issue has implications for our foreign and defense policy that will reverberate long after this operation is completed.

America has always been viewed as a light to all nations, guiding them to peace, freedom, and self-determination. We are a nation dedicated to certain principles and ideals, and we take those principles and ideals seriously enough that we include their very preservation and advancement as part of our national interest. But we must never lose sight of the fact that a nation's first responsibility is to its own people.

We, in this body, must never develop a foreign policy that loses sight of that primary responsibility, and that the lives and safety of our troops, whether they be volunteers or conscripts, are just as much a vital national security interest as are the lives of our civilian citizens. In practice then, we should commit our forces only when, where, and to the extent appropriate, to meet our stated national goals and to protect our national interests.

Therefore, Mr. President, the level of our commitment to a particular undertaking should be concomitant with the level of the threat to our national interests. Some situations threaten our very existence, while others only marginally affect us. Many will lie somewhere in the middle. Where such threats to our national security are significant and definite, like those we faced in World War II, we must respond decisively and with all available military force. But in those cases where our national interests lie somewhere between the extremes, as I believe is the case in the Balkans, it is not necessary to respond with the same level of absolute commitment and force that we would use against those definite threats to our vital national security interests.

Mr. President, we must also examine not only what our chances of success will be in a particular undertaking, but also what will be the potential costs—in the lives of America's soldiers and in our national prestige. Just as the level of our interests will lie somewhere along a broad scale, so too will the potential benefits and costs. Every effort must be made to assess and decide whether the potential benefits in advancing our national interests justify the costs.

Mr. President, in my view, the United States has an interest in long-term stability and peace in the Balkans. The war has consumed the interests of Europe for the past 4 years and has increasingly become an item of disagreement and discord between the United States and our NATO allies, an alliance where continued U.S. leadership is vital to our interests. Former adversaries in Eastern Europe and the Middle East, with whom we previously thought we were developing new and friendlier relations, are using this war as an opportunity to expand their influence and control. Our leadership in NATO, and with the emerging European democratic states, will be pivotal to what Europe will look like for generations to come. We must remain engaged with these states, and must accept that their problems, more or less are our problems too. Further, old divisions between East and West are exacerbated by this conflict because of the critical role the mixing of Eastern and Western religions play in the continued hatred and strife of the region. These conflicts undermine stability and therefore directly impact upon U.S. national interests.

Finally, and certainly not least, the United States has a very real interest in putting an end to the atrocities and carnage that has shattered this region. At the end of World War II, we said we would never again allow another Holocaust. Where we have an opportunity to end mass and indiscriminate killing, which will live in our memories for generations to come, we must seize such opportunities where we legitimately believe we can succeed.

Mr. President, while there is a definite U.S. interest to be advanced in this situation, it is only worth acting if

we employ a strategy that both ensures the conditions for a genuine peace and which establishes a rational strategy for the eventual withdrawal of our troops. Therefore, I believe any strategy for peace and stability in the Balkans must, in part, be based upon addressing the fundamental military imbalance between the Serbs and the Muslim-Croatian Federation. If we had previously lifted the arms embargo, we would not be debating this deployment today. Yes, the conflict would have probably intensified at first, but I believe the Muslim-Croatian Federation would have then been able to develop a credible military deterrent, and there would be no need for 60,000 troops to implement the peace. Now, again, a balance must exist or peace will evaporate as soon as the Implementation Force withdraws. The current administration policy fails to set in motion a plan to achieve this balance.

It is also clear to me that any strategy based upon the deployment of United States ground troops to Bosnia must include a definition of what will be the conditions for declaring final success in this venture. A pitfall we must avoid in achieving that success is to utilize our troops in the inappropriate mission of nation-building. I understand suitable political structures must be in place to allow the ballot to replace the bullet as the agent of change, but the role of our troops must be strictly limited to establishing the necessary military stability so as to allow the civilians the opportunity to develop the necessary political institutions.

When we have defined our criteria for success, we must also have in place a definite withdrawal plan that clearly establishes the conditions and terms for the termination of this mission. In my view, the current administration plan is based upon the faulty assumptions that our mere presence in Bosnia is the goal, and that peace under any terms is preferable to battling for a just victory.

Mr. President, short of committing ground troops to Bosnia, I believe there are several roles which the United States can and should fill to advance the cause of a just and stable peace in the Balkans. Among those roles which I feel are appropriate for the United States include contributing significant air and naval forces to the NATO operation in the Balkans, providing a large part of the logistical and financial resources for this operation, and participating in efforts to provide military assistance and training to the Muslim-Croatian Federation.

However, the President's decision to deploy United States ground troops directly into Bosnia and Herzegovina is, in my view, a grievous mistake. As I stated earlier, I believe it is in America's interests to advance the cause of peace, justice, and stability in the Balkans. But it is not such an absolute or vital national interest that it justifies the extremely high risk of deploying ground troops to the region.

Mr. President, I believe U.S. troops are particularly ill-suited for peacekeeping missions of this type because they present such a ripe political target. Whether rightly or wrongly, a dead American soldier captured on TV cameras will be broadcast around the world. I doubt the same can be said for the soldiers from traditional peacekeeping contributors. And that is exactly what a belligerent wants; that intense media coverage and scrutiny that covers American troops. That is why our troops have rarely been used as peacekeepers. Look at what happened in Somalia. U.S. forces were specifically targeted, and subsequently drawn much further into the conflict than originally planned, because of the significant political position they occupy for no other reason than that they were American soldiers. Therefore, I believe peacekeeping is best conducted by smaller countries not perceived as having any vested interest in the outcome of a conflict, and therefore can undeniably claim to be neutral.

The question of U.S. leadership does not rest on the end of an infantryman's rifle barrel. The United States can maintain, even advance, its international credibility, its preeminence in the NATO alliance, and its role as the world's sole superpower, without having to contribute a disproportionate share of the troops on the ground. Indeed, I believe it is imprudent to claim that the sole measure of United States leadership and commitment to peace in the Balkans can only be measured by the number of troops we commit to the Implementation Force.

Were a more vital United States interest at stake in the Balkans, and were not it clear that the United States can still participate significantly in implementing this peace accord without using its ground troops, my views may be different. But given the extreme risk to which I believe they will be subjected, and the clear availability of for other countries to provide these peacekeeping troops, I believe placing our forces on the ground in Bosnia and Herzegovina is unjustified.

In light of the foregoing analysis, I concluded that I could not support H.R. 2606, which would prohibit the expenditure of funds for the deployment of United States troops to Bosnia absent a specific Congressional appropriation. Limiting the expenditure of funds at this stage of the operation will unduly jeopardize our troops in the field just at the exact time that they most need Congressional support. I would also refer to the arguments made by the Majority Leader, himself a distinguished veteran, who related the incredible damage done to the morale of our troops serving in Vietnam when this Congress debated cutting off the funds for our troops involved in that war. We should not, in my judgment, place our troops in that position.

Mr. President, as I stated earlier, our interests in the region are not so great that they warrant placing United States ground troops under the extraordinary risk they would face in Bosnia. Therefore, I wholeheartedly support the Hutchison-Inhofe-Craig-Nickles resolution opposing the deployment of U.S. ground troops. This Sense of the Senate Resolution expresses, on the record, our disagreement with the President's decision to deploy ground troops to Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Unfortunately the President is, in fact, deploying U.S. ground troops. Mr. President, this deployment is a fait àccompli, initiated unilaterally by the President over the strongest and repeated objections of both Houses of Congress, and one which the President will continue no matter how strongly we protest. Thus, even though many of us oppose this deployment, I believe we have an opportunity, and an obligation, to clearly define the limits under which the President can carry out this imprudent deployment.

It is in this light that I have decided to support the Dole-McCain resolution. I want to thank the sponsors for incorporating language that I had recommended making clear that the Congress is simply acquiescing to the fact that this deployment is a fait àccompli. With this language, the resolution clearly states our misgivings, and I quote: ''Notwithstanding reservations expressed about President Clinton's decision to deploy United States Armed Forces to Bosnia and Herzegovina. . . The President may only fulfill his commitment [and I stress this is the President's commitment] to deploy United States Armed Forces. . . subject to the conditions'' of this resolution.

Mr. President, I can't speak for others, but my vote for this resolution in no way constitutes an endorsement, authorization, or approval of the President's decision to send United States ground troops into Bosnia. In fact, the language I submitted distinctly helps separate this resolution from any endorsement of the President's actions by citing our reservations and placing the origin of this deployment clearly with the President.

As I just quoted, this resolution further states that, in light of the President's decision to deploy U.S. troops, he may quote, ''only fulfill his commitment,'' unquote if he meets the conditions established to safeguard our troops and further the success of the mission. Mr. President, I believe that point needs to be repeated. This is the President's decision, a commitment the President made over our repeated objections. Therefore, under the Dole-McCain resolution, he may only, and I stress only, fulfill quote ''his'' unquote commitment, if meets the following conditions.

First, the resolution recognizes the extreme danger in which U.S. troops will be placed, and establishes rational conditions for their safe withdrawal and limited military employment. The Dole-McCain resolution establishes

clear and unequivocal language that requires the President to take all possible measures to protect our forces, and to periodically report to Congress the success of those specific measures.

It also builds upon the recognition that the Muslim-Croatian Federation must be further armed, trained and strengthened if a credible and stable military balance is to be established in the region. We cannot simply accept the President's assurances that he will find some way to make this happen. If the United States forces withdraw only to see an out gunned Bosnian-Croatian Federation quickly overrun by a patient aggressor, our troops' sacrifice will be for naught. We have the power to give meaning to their sacrifice, and this resolution does just that.

Last, the Dole-McCain resolution will strictly limit the operations of our forces to legitimately military tasks. We have repeatedly seen the inefficacy of using U.S. military forces for nation-building exercises. The General Framework Agreement is, in my opinion, fraught with pitfalls that will draw the Implementation Force fully into the tasks more clearly the purview of the civilian High Representative's authority. This body has the opportunity to protect our troops from being needlessly employed in such dangerous non-military tasks, and this resolution does so.

This is, in my opinion, far from a perfect response to the situation the President has presented this Congress. I believe the President has acted hastily, and that his policy places our troops in the unnecessarily dangerous role of vulnerable peace implementors. However, when presented with the reality that our troops will go to Bosnia, regardless of our actions, I believe we must act where we can to constrain the imprudent strategy of the administration. The Dole-McCain resolution does not approve, endorse or authorize the President's policy. However, it clearly constrains the conduct of this operation so as to better protect our troops in Bosnia, and to better ensure mission's ultimate success.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JEFFORDS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I rise to speak on behalf of the Dole-McCain resolution.

As each of us decides whether or not to support U.S. involvement in this military operation, we must consider that we are sending young soldiers overseas and that their lives are possibly on the line.

As I evaluated our involvement in this effort, I reflected on my own situation during World War II. When I enlisted in the Army, my father was terminally ill and my mother was about to become a widow. I recall the letters that I wrote from Europe to my mother, who, like the parents of those soldiers being sent to Bosnia, prayed every day for my safe return. Those were not easy times. But I also recall the deep pride that I felt and the moral good that ultimately came from ending Hitler's fascist conquests.

Mr. President, like many Americans, I have been troubled by the prospective costs in human lives of the war in Bosnia. With America's diplomatic support, the warring parties have negotiated a truce and are prepared to sign a peace agreement and are requesting the assistance of America's military to help monitor and enforce it.

I do not agree with those who argue that our country has no national interest in helping to enforce a peace agreement. We must, if we possibly can, prevent the further spread of this tragic conflict, in part, because further conflict threatens the stability of, perhaps, the whole of Europe. If the war spreads, America runs the risk of being enveloped in a much larger conflict. By committing a small number of soldiers now, we may reduce the likelihood that more American troops could be required in Europe later on.

As the architect of the peace agreement, and as the leader of NATO, only the United States can lead this effort and put an end to this senseless bloodshed that has taken 250,000 lives, torn that country apart, and displaced 2 million refugees.

Mr. President, sending American troops seems to be the best option available to the United States to help guarantee peace in Europe. While the Dayton peace agreement is far from perfect, it is the only peace agreement that the parties in the conflict have agreed to implement. If successfully implemented and coupled with the arming and training of the Bosnian Moslems before IFOR departs, the agreement holds a promise, in the long run, of ending the violence that has terrorized the people of Bosnia. The alternative is unacceptable—to let the war resume. If the international community does not step in now, it is obvious that more lives will be lost and more refugees will be displaced, and there will be more bloodshed and carnage, and America's credibility as an international leader is also on the line. Our leadership brought the parties to the negotiating table, and our leadership was requested by those parties to help enforce the agreement.

I understand the view that the Congress should have been consulted more closely before the decision to send troops was made. But forcing America to back away from the President's commitment is not the solution. To do so would undermine the morale of our fighting force. Even more, it would diminish our credibility in the international community and send a message to aggressors worldwide that they have nothing to fear from America.

I know that U.S. participation in this endeavor is not risk-free. Passions run high in an area where weapons are plentiful. Millions of landmines lay just below the Earth's surface, and weather conditions are likely to be unfriendly. I am persuaded, however, that General Shalikashvili and Secretary Perry have assiduously worked to minimize the risks, and they believe that the risk level has been reduced to its barest minimum level, and that the mission has clear objectives, a sufficiently potent force, an effective command and control structure under American leadership, no-nonsense rules of engagement, a clear time limit, and the cooperation of the various factions.

American troops will have well-defined rules of engagement. They will, as President Clinton said, fight fire with fire, and then some. Our troops will have a clearly defined military mission and will not participate in nation-building tasks. Once again, they will be under American command.

Our soldiers will have the firepower, training, explicit instructions, and authorization necessary to defend themselves and others. They have been trained to deal with every major threat, including landmines, civil disorder, and snipers. I have been assured by General Shalikashvili and Secretary Perry that our troops have the appropriate level of training and are prepared and ready for this peace enforcement mission.

Mr. President, though it is always painful to send American soldiers overseas, I believe the goals of this limited deployment are appropriate. While it is our solemn responsibility to make wise decisions about sending American troops abroad, I have been assured by our military leaders that the members of our All-Volunteer force are prepared for this mission.

America can make a difference in securing the peace in Bosnia. We ought to remain engaged in that endeavor. I hope, Mr. President, that my colleagues will support the Dole-McCain resolution and our troops. I wish them well on this peace mission.

Mr. President, I support America's troops as they head off to Bosnia to help enforce and implement the peace agreement.

As each of us decides about whether or not to support U.S. involvement in this military operation, we need to be mindful of the fact that we are sending young soldiers overseas and that their lives are possibly on the line.

As I evaluated America's involvement in the international effort to enforce a peace agreement in Bosnia, I have reflected on my own situation during the Second World War. When I enlisted in the Army, my father was terminally ill, and my mother was about to become a widow.

While she tended to my father's minute-to-minute needs and also to see that my 12-year-old sister met her

school and personal commitments, I was in uniform.

As I considered America's involvement in this military operation in Bosnia, I recalled the letters I wrote from Europe to my mother in New Jersey, who like the parents of those soldiers being sent to Bosnia, prayed every day for my safe return.

I recalled the deep pride I felt serving my country, and have reflected on the values American soldiers fought for during that conflict and the moral good that came from bringing an end to Hitler's fascist conquests.

Like many Americans, I have been deeply troubled by the cost—in injury and human life—of the war that raged on in Bosnia for the last 3½ years. And I have been haunted by all-too-familiar photographs from the war in the Balkans.

Terrified children left orphaned after slaughter. Moslem women raped by their Bosnian Serb captors. Innocents lying dead in the street. U.N. soldiers chained to poles as human shields. Reports of mass executions and graves.

To their credit, the warring parties have agreed to end these atrocities and open a new chapter in their history.

With America's diplomatic support,they have negotiated a peace agreement which holds the promise of ending the brutality that has inflicted so much pain on their people for so many years. Now that a peace agreement has been negotiated, the parties to the conflict are requesting the assistance of America's military to help monitor and enforce it.

There are many reasons why I believe the Congress should support U.S. involvement in a NATO-led international peace enforcement operation.

I do not agree, Mr. President, with those who argue that the United States has no national interest in intervening to enforce a peace agreement to end this conflict.

The United States does have a national interest in supporting a peaceful end to the bloody conflict in Europe. We must prevent the further spread of this tragic conflict, not only because of its impact on the people of Bosnia, but because further conflict threatens the stability of Europe.

If the war spreads and more countries are drawn into the conflict, America runs the risk of being enveloped in a much larger conflict. By committing 20,000 American soldiers to this international peace enforcement operation now, we may reduce the likelihood that more American troops could be required in Europe later.

While I also understand the view of those who believe Bosnia is a European problem that the Europeans should enforce and monitor the peace agreement on their own, the reality is that without the leadership and direct participation of the United States in this international effort, the peace agreement would go nowhere. The Europeans, through NATO, will be engaged as our partner in this peace enforcement mission.

But as the architect of the peace agreement and as the leader of NATO, only the United States can lead the effort to enforce the peace agreement and put an end to the senseless bloodshed and loss of innocent lives. Only our Nation can lead the way in enforcing the peace agreement which will stop the carnage that has taken 250,000 lives, torn the country apart, and displaced 2 million refugees.

Sending American troops to help enforce and monitor this peace agreement is the best option available to the United States to help guarantee peace in Europe. While the Dayton peace agreement is far from perfect, it is the only peace agreement that the parties to the conflict have agreed to implement.

It will not reunite Bosnia and Herzegovina, but it will, if given a chance to succeed, restore peace, calm, and civility to the region. It will not bring back the lives of those senselessly slaughtered by perpetrators of war crimes, but it will guard future atrocities and ensure that such perpetrators are prohibited from serving in government.

If successfully implemented and coupled with the arming and training of the Bosnian Moslems before IFOR departs, it holds the promise, in the long run, of ending the bloodshed and violence that have terrorized the people of Bosnia for so long.

Mr. President, the alternative to sending U.S. troops to help implement and enforce this peace agreement, is to let the war resume. If the international community does not step in now to enforce this peace agreement, more lives will be lost.

More refugees will be displaced. More children will be orphaned. There will be more bloodshed and carnage. There will be a greater likelihood that the United States will need to intervene at a later time.

America's credibility as an international leader is also on the line. Our leadership brought the parties to the negotiating table, and our leadership was requested by those parties to help enforce and monitor the peace agreement.

I understand the view of many that the Congress should have been more closely consulted before the decision to send troops was made. But I do not believe that forcing America to back away from the President's commitment is the solution in this case. To do so would invite attacks on our troops by those opponents of peace who hope to force the international community out of the Balkans. It would undermine the morale of our troops.

Even more, it would diminish our credibility in the International community. It would send a message to aggressors worldwide that they have little to fear from America. It could be perceived as a green light for the North Koreans to march south. It could be perceived as a green light for Sadaam Hussein to do the same.

To be sure, it would also undermine America's role as NATO's leader.

I know, Mr. President, that U.S. participation in this mission is not risk free.

The parties to the conflict have been fighting for years, and passions run high in an area where weapons are plentiful. Millions of landmines lay just below the Earth's surface, and adverse weather conditions will, no doubt, create difficulties for our soldiers.

But I do not believe these difficulties are insurmountable. Nor do I believe they should keep America from joining the international community in enforcing a peace agreement aimed at stopping the worst atrocities on European soil since the Second World War.

I am persuaded that General Shalikashvili and Secretary Perry have assiduously worked to minimize those risks. They believe the risk level has been minimized and that the mission has clear objectives, a sufficiently potent force, an effective command and control structure under American leadership, no-nonsense rules of engagement, a clear time limit, and the cooperation of the various factions.

American troops participating in this international peace enforcement operation will have well defined rules of engagement. Unlike the lightly armed U.N. peacekeepers previously stationed in Bosnia, American soldiers will be permitted to use force—including deadly force—in cases of self-defense or to protect against a hostile act or hostile intent. They will, as President Clinton said, ''fight fire with fire, and then some.''

Out troops will have a clearly defined military mission. They will monitor the cease-fire line, the zones of separation, and, when needed, enforce withdrawal from the zones of separation. They will not participate in nation-building tasks.

They will be under American command.

Our soldiers will have the firepower, training, explicit instructions, and authorization necessary to defend themselves and others. They have been trained to deal with every major threat, including landmine, civil disorder, and snipers.

I have been assured by General Shalikashvili and Secretary Perry that our troops are well trained, prepared, and ready for this peace enforcement mission.

Though it is never easy to send American soldiers overseas, I believe the goals of this limited deployment are meritorious. While it is our solemn responsibility to make wise decisions about sending American troops, I have been assured by our military leaders that the members of our all volunteer force are prepared for this mission.

America can make a difference in securing the peace in Bosnia, and we ought to remain engaged in that endeavor. I hope my colleagues will support the Dole-McCain resolution and

our troops. I wish them well on this peace mission.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I wonder if the Chair could outline the current situation in terms of time allocation so that I might speak for a few minutes if it is available.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority has 34 minutes remaining; the majority has 29 minutes. If there is no objection, the Senator is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Thank you, Mr. President. I know the occupant of the chair is a very thoughtful Senator and reviews each situation that comes before him very carefully. We shared a trip to Croatia a couple years ago and had the opportunity to see just on the periphery what happens when the hatred and the venom is unleashed to deal with problems, as those who are there saw fit. We were shocked to learn about the murder of neighbors by other farm neighbors, using farm implements to do the killing and the maiming, and the story about the women locked in a gymnasium after they had been raped by then-renegade rogue Serbian soldiers and made to stay in that facility so they could not dispose of those pregnancies in any way but to deliver a child not of their choice, one that the enemy, their enemy, decided would be an appropriate way of fathering another race.

It recalls for all of us a time just over 40 years ago when it was decided by another Fascist that there would be a super race put upon this Earth, and by artificial insemination, rape and coercion, women were made pregnant to carry members of that super race. It was intolerable. When we learned about it we were shocked and horrified. Now we saw similar things taking place. The world stood by—an unacceptable condition—in a world purportedly civilized, and thusly when we debate the issue here, Mr. President, about whether or not we have a national interest, we have a global interest, we have a human interest.

Yes, it is true that America cannot be the police force around the world, and the questions are raised, why did we do it in this place and why did we not do it in that place? One of the reasons is we were not welcomed by anybody. We saw what happened when our young people were sent to Somalia with an indefinite engagement in front of them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I thank the Chair. I see my colleague from Florida is here.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized.

Mr. GRAHAM. I thank my colleague, Senator LAUTENBERG.

Mr. President, I recently received a letter from Catherine and Crosby Dawkins of Jacksonville, FL. The letter read in part:

> We cannot see any compelling reason for risking the lives of United States servicemen in a centuries old dispute, even though we grieve for the plight of the women and children. If European countries believe the conflict will spread, they should take action.

Mr. President, like many of us, I have received hundreds, possibly thousands of communiques similar to this—deep felt concerns about the risk of American soldiers in Bosnia. These thoughtful letters deserve a response. I take this opportunity to address not only my colleagues in the Senate but also my fellow citizens of Florida who have been so generous and so thoughtful in their letters.

Mr. President, this raises an issue of the United States military troops in Bosnia, a fundamental question of what are the options of the United States in this post-cold-war era? For half a century, the United States knew with clarity and with national unity what its objectives were. Its objectives were to suppress the totalitarianism of Nazism. The goal was to restrain the imperial impulses of the Soviet Union.

Now the United States is charting a new course of action. We have essentially limited options. One of those options, Mr. President, in the post-cold-war era is to stand on the sideline, to essentially be an observer of the world, as we were for much of our Nation's history.

The second option is to be the world's defender, to be prepared to intervene in every conflict.

The third option is to carefully assess our interest and, when a situation begs our involvement, to work within our capabilities to build international coalitions to respond to the conflict. I strongly feel that that third option is the option which is most appropriate and most applicable to the situation that we face tonight in Bosnia.

In assessing the question as to whether our interests in Bosnia are sufficient to beg our involvement, I suggest that our interests do require our involvement. This is not a complete list, but I believe a compelling list of those reasons. The United States has a deep interest in human rights. One of the things that distinguishes our country from those nations which preceded it is that we believe that the purpose of government is to protect and advance the rights of individuals. We found that not only to be a guiding principle in our domestic policy but also in our foreign policy.

One of the great initial disputes in this Nation was over the question of whether the United States should become involved in the French Revolution. Many said that the United States should stand apart, that we were too small to be effective, and too distant to be effective.

Thomas Jefferson said we meant those words in the Declaration of Independence not just to stand for Americans, or for English colonialists, but they were universal principles of human rights, and that we had not only been given by God certain inalienable rights but also by God, responsibilities to defend those rights wherever they were in jeopardy.

That principle of America's special role in the world that from the very beginning of our Nation has so shaped our culture, is at risk tonight.

We also have some more immediate interests. We have an interest in preserving the international coalition which we know as NATO, a coalition which has served us well in terms of deterring the Soviet Union and which, in all likelihood, will serve us well in the unknown, uncharted future into which we move in the post-cold-war era. If we were to retreat from our commitments to NATO on this, the eve of the signing of the peace agreements in Paris, I think that institution would be forever shattered.

We also have the opportunity by acting tonight to avoid the potential of this horrendous strife, which has taken a quarter of a million lives, rendered 3 million people as refugees, from spreading—spreading first throughout the former Yugoslavia and then throughout the Balkans and then, as we have seen twice in this century, throughout Europe.

We have a deep stake in avoiding having to do what this country has done twice in this century, and that is send American men and women, not as peacekeepers, but as combatants in a war in Europe.

Finally, I think we have a strong interest in demonstrating to the people of the world that our concern for human rights is not limited to people who look like us, attend the same religious institutions as we do, have our same cultural background. There is today an emerging fundamentalism within the Islamic religion. That fundamentalism is receiving support and reassurance from what they see Western Europeans have done, including the United States of America, in Bosnia today.

I believe it is important that we, by our actions now, indicate that we are prepared to stand for the cause of human rights, and protect them wherever our interests indicate that it is appropriate to do so; that we, by so doing, will send a signal that we are prepared to support the responsible elements of the Islamic religion and Islamic nations.

Mr. President, I conclude by citing what we heard just a few hours ago in the House Chamber, the statement made by the Prime Minister of Israel, Shimon Peres.

Mr. President, less than 24 hours ago, Shimon Peres addressed the Congress and the American people on the need

for American leadership in the 21st century. He said:

> Even in this very day, as Bosnia reels in agony, you offered a compass and a lamp to a confused situation like in the Middle East. Nobody else was able or was ready to do it. . .
>
> America, in my judgment, cannot escape what history has laid on your shoulders . . . You cannot escape that which America alone can do. America alone can keep the world free and assist nations to assume the responsibility for their own fate.

Mr. President, that is what is at stake in the decision that we will make this evening.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Mr. President, it is very difficult to make an important statement with a limited time, but I want to say that I support the President's peacemaking initiative and the Dayton accord and I support the NATO operation in Bosnia. I support the President because I believe that it is our patriotic duty and the right thing to do. I believe that we have an obligation to nurture the peace and to convince warring nations, whenever possible, that the United States will make an effort to help them resolve their conflicts.

This decision was not made easily.

I have, for a long time now, differed with the President on Bosnia policy. Specifically, I have favored the lifting of the arms embargo against the Bosnian Moslems—a policy change that would have assisted the Moslems in defending themselves.

My decision was made only after meeting with the President and his military advisers, carefully considering their views, and deliberating the pros and cons of a U.S. peacekeeping role.

It has been complicated by the fact that the State of Illinois has the largest number of reservists being called up to support our troop deployment to Bosnia. Moreover, I have an 18-year-old son whom I would not want to see put in harm's way should the situation in Bosnia take an untoward turn.

Like most Americans, I am concerned about the risks involved in sending United States ground troops to Bosnia. I want to be sure that the Administration has thought through and addressed all the important questions before United States forces are committed to Bosnia. These questions include the rules of engagement, command structure, the length of our commitment, our exit strategy, and our contingency plans should the peace plan start to unravel, or the warring factions fail to make good on their promises.

But the President has satisfactorily answered each of those concerns, and he has made a strong case on why Congress and the American people should support his decision to send United States peacekeeping forces to Bosnia.

First, the NATO mission is clearly defined, limited, and achievable. It is to implement the military aspects of the peace accord to monitor the cease-fire, to control the airspace, and to patrol the exclusionary zone separating the former combatants. It does not involve ''nation building'' or acting as a police force. Moreover, it is not the kind of vague undefined ''presence'' that led to the United States tragedy in Lebanon. Most important, there is no danger of the kind of ''mission creep'' that occurred in Somalia.

Second, U.S. troops will not be passive, lightly armed peacekeepers as the U.N. forces have been. They will be heavily armed and have the tanks, the artillery, and the air power necessary to respond forcefully to any threat or challenge.

Third, the rules of engagement are clear, aggressive and unambiguous. They are designed to maximize the safety of our troops. Specifically, U.S. forces will have the authority to meet any threat or violation of the peace agreement with ''immediate and decisive force.''

Fourth, our commitment is not open-ended. It is planned that United States forces will be deployed in Bosnia for about a year. Military experts suggest it may be less than that.

Fifth, NATO peacekeepers will be under the command of Adm. Leighton W. Smith, Jr., and U.S. soldiers will only take orders from American commanders.

Finally, I have been informed that an effective exit strategy and a carefully constructed contingency plan have been developed, should the peace accord begin to unravel.

No one is underestimating, nor have we any illusions about the difficulties, dangers, and risks of this peacekeeping operation. Sending 20,000 of America's finest young men and women to Bosnia to implement the military provisions of the general framework for peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina is a risky proposition. The conflict there has been long-standing and brutal. The weather is inhospitable and the terrain is treacherous. There are more than 6 million land mines scattered throughout the country. Renegade bands have openly stated their opposition to provisions of the Dayton accord with which they disagree. Finally, all previous cease-fire agreements have ended in failure. Viewed separately, each of these factors imperils the safety of our soldiers; viewed as a whole, the possibility of American casualties is unfortunately very real.

However, we also have to consider the consequences of a failure of United States leadership in Bosnia. If we retreat now on the commitment the President has made, the Dayton agreement would collapse. The war would likely reignite. The slaughter of innocents would begin anew.

'Even if there were no Dayton agreement to go back on, however, failure to act would have the most serious kinds of consequences for the United States. A failure by the United States to lead now could well represent a turning point for the entire NATO alliance, and NATO is the cornerstone of United States national security policy abroad. The United States is NATO's leader. If we fail to lead on an issue of such great importance to NATO, we must expect that kind of failure to have serious consequences for the United States, both in Europe and elsewhere around the world.

Moreover, a failure to act in Bosnia could well lead to broader conflict, one that could have far greater consequences for the United States down the road. If the current conflict is not at least contained, the losing side may well seek allies to redress its defeats on the battlefield. As more parties are drawn in, the conflict becomes ever more larger and ever more serious.

We have already seen that in Bosnia. We have already seen this dynamic at work, the conflict became much larger in the last year, with more parties, and more forces involved, than were engaged 4 years ago. Simply letting the parties fight it out, and watching the conflict continue to grow, is therefore not an acceptable option.

For all its weakness and risks—and the risks are substntial—the Dayton peace agreement still represents our best chance for a durable, lasting peace. It preserves Bosnia within its present borders, provides for free elections, and gives refugees a right to return to their homes.

The Dayton accord calls on NATO to implement the provisions of the agreement. As the unquestioned leader of NATO, U.S. participation in the proposed NATO peacekeeping operation is essential. Without a strong, visible American participation, the hard won negotiated peace in Dayton will unravel and be lost.

For these reasons I did not support H.R. 2206 and will not support the Hutchison-Inhofe resolutions. The Dole-McCain resolution at least acknowledges the leadership role of the United States in NATO and the necessity of our participation in the NATO peacekeeping operation. It also acknowledges many of the essential provisions of the Dayton accord. Finally, the Dole-McCain resolution unequivocally supports our men and women in the military. For these reasons, I will vote in favor of the Dole-McCain resolution and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. President, problems in Europe have twice led to world wars this century. Problems in Europe caused the United States to fundamentally change its foreign policy posture. Since the end of World War II, the United States has made a conscious decision to stay politically, economically, and strategically engaged in Europe. During the cold war we spent trillions of dollars and based hundreds of thousands of American troops in Europe to protect these interests. Clearly the peace, security, stability, freedom, and prosperity of Europe are still vital national interests for the United States, and the vehicle for achieving those interests is NATO.

There is no more difficult—or unpopular—decision an American President can make than to put U.S. armed forces in harm's way. The President has exercised his constitutional prerogative as Commander in Chief, and American troops are being deployed to safeguard vital national interests. Our troops are well-trained for the challenges that await them, and they are prepared to do their duty. They are cognizant of the risks of their chosen profession and are more than willing to make the necessary sacrifices to bring peace and freedom to a war-torn land. All they ask is to know the parameters of their mission in advance, which the President has done, and that Congress and the American people stand behind them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, none of us in the U.S. Senate, as is clear from the quality of this debate, takes lightly the responsibility of sending American troops into the potential of harm's way. But as each of us decides whether or not to support the President's decision to deploy American troops in Bosnia, I think we need to keep two essential points in mind.

The first is—and it must be reiterated again and again and again—the President is not sending American troops, nor are we ratifying the sending of American troops to Bosnia for the purpose of fighting a war. On the face of it, that may seem like an obvious point. But as I talk to citizens in my home State and listen to people across the country, many Americans do not yet understand what the mission is about or how it may be performed.

We are not sending—nor do I intend to send or want to send—American forces to Bosnia to fight a war. We are not sending American forces to Bosnia to crush enemy forces the way we did in World War II. We are not sending American soldiers to Bosnia to roll back communism the way we tried to in Vietnam, nor are we sending them there to repeal aggression as we did in the Persian Gulf.

The President is asking us to approve sending American troops to Bosnia at the request of parties to a peace agreement, at the request of parties to a conflict who are asking us and other nations to join together to help them to implement a peace that they have stated they want.

To be sure, war has raged in Bosnia for 4 years, but it is not raging now. A cease-fire has been in place since October, and the parties to the conflict have exhausted themselves. And, for the first time in 4 years, they have opted for peace over war.

This Senator contemplates only keeping troops in Bosnia for so long as the parties continue to opt for peace over war. It is their challenge now, not ours, to ensure that all of the elements under their control, under the control of each of them individually, are prepared to accept the peace.

Recent events, such as the destruction by Bosnia and Croat troops of towns to be turned over to the Bosnian Serbs and the stated opposition of Bosnian Serbs in Sarajevo to the peace accords, suggest that even after 4 years of fighting it will indeed take some time to convince those on the ground that this peace agreement is in their interest and that the risks for doing that are real. But that is precisely why this NATO force is needed and is so critical. And it is precisely why we must participate in that force, only if we are to try to give them the chance to make the peace they say they want. In no way should we contemplate making that peace ourselves.

The second critical point we need to keep in mind, Mr. President, is, as I listen to the debate, some Members assert that there is no vital national interest in Bosnia, and I have heard throughout this debate sort of a standard of vital strategic interest, vital national interest. Mr. President, that is the wrong test to apply to Bosnia.

Our vital national interests are our territorial integrity, our political system and ideology, our economic security, and our way of life. We have gone to war four times in this century with the belief that we were protecting them. But let us say clearly up front, in this conflict, in this effort, in this mission, they are not at stake. That is not what is at issue here, and no one pretends that is why we should be involved. That is not what we are doing. We are not going to war to protect a vital national security interest. We are not even sending troops for a vital national security interest.

Whether vital national security interests are at stake is the right question to ask, Mr. President, if you are deciding whether or not to send troops to war, it is not the right question to ask when you are being asked to participate in a multilateral, internationally sanctioned effort to help keep a peace which parties have said they want. And we should remember that we are not being asked to do this alone. We are doing this in conjunction with perhaps 30 other countries.

In many ways, Mr. President, Bosnia is the prototype of the kind of conflict the international community will face in the years ahead as forces, once held in check by superpower politics, are unleashed and, with them, the potential for conflicts all across the globe.

I think it is vital for us to understand that the test is really whether or not there are interests, whether or not there are important interests, that outweigh the risks of our participation.

Mr. President, I have heard colleagues talk about the issue of credibility. Some are going to suggest that the only reason they are prepared to vote to send these troops is to uphold the credibility of the country or the credibility of the President.

Let me say, Mr. President, with searing memories of Vietnam, that is not a reason to send our young military people into harm's way. I remember the phrase, ''I will not be the first President to lose a war,'' and we lost tens of thousands of young people over the issue of pride, over the issue of unwillingness to do anything except to sustain somebody's credibility as people saw it. Credibility has to have an underlying notion. It is not an abstract concept which merits the taking of the life of a young American or the giving of a life of a young American. Credibility has to be based on some underlying interest which puts your credibility at stake.

I believe, Mr. President, that that vote—the credibility—is a hedge against a willingness to commit to this President's vision of what credibility might be at stake here.

I believe there are legitimate interests for taking the risk of trying to uphold the peace—not to fight a war, but to try to uphold a peace.

First, how could we as a nation avoid the moral interest in ending the worst atrocities in Europe since World War II? Whoever thought that after World War II Europe would again be the site of human beings being raped as a policy of war, tortured, murdered, separated from families, or thrown out of their homes simply because of ethnic background?

Who will forget quickly the stories recently that drove us to feel compelled to simply leave them to fight for themselves—headlines such as ''Bosnia's Orphans of Rape; Innocent Legacy of Hatred,'' ''Mass Graves Probed in Northwest Bosnia,'' ''Anybody Who Moved or Screamed Was Killed: Thousands Massacred on Bosnia Trek in July,'' ''Srebrenica: The Days of Slaughter''?

Who can forget the imperative of the words that we memorialize in Washington and elsewhere in this country, ''Never again''?

That is an interest, Mr. President.

Twice in this century Europe was engulfed by war, and the United States fought to save it. We have already invested our blood in the stability and in the prospect of democracy and the future of Europe.

That is an interest, Mr. President.

The conflict in Bosnia has the potential for spillover—and could become a wider war—to areas where ethnic tensions are high: Kosovo, Albania, Macedonia, Greece, and Turkey.

That is an interest, Mr. President.

So we have an interest in ensuring that those things do not happen. We also have an interest in the risks to American forces and to NATO, and the cost of ensuring a peace in Bosnia now will inevitably be less than if we would have to respond to a wider conflict in the future.

Finally, we do have an important interest in demonstrating leadership on an international community level that we have the capacity and the will to lead in the post-cold war world.

For far too long American policy toward Bosnia was vague, vacillating and

ineffective. Now, to the credit of this administration, to our country, we have changed that. And now we are trying to join together with our European allies in an effort to provide the strong response that stopped the Bosnian Serb attacks, that did try to provide a humanitarian corridor, that upheld the notion of international law, and that was willing to try to enforce the concept of safe areas.

Having led the effort—an extraordinary effort by the President, Secretary Christopher, and Assistant Secretary Holbrooke—having led that effort, Mr. President, how do we not have an interest that goes beyond mere credibility in trying now to implement the settlement which we ourselves have instigated and helped put together?

As President Clinton has said, if we do not participate in this operation, there will be no NATO force and the war in Bosnia will begin again. Our moral and political interests in Bosnia and our sense of responsibility demand that we not let that happen—and that we not be ultimately dragged in.

So Mr. President, it is because credibility is based on real interests that I support the President's decision to send our forces to Bosnia but I believe just as firmly the President owes it to the American people and Congress to ensure that the operation is limited in terms of the mission, limited in terms of the goals we set for success, and limited in duration.

As defined by the Dayton peace agreement, the mission of our troops and others participating in IFOR, the Bosnia Peace Implementation Force, is to monitor and enforce compliance with the military aspects of the peace agreement—that is, enforcing the cease-fire, supervising the withdrawal of forces to agreed lines, establishing a zone of separation between them, and returning troops and weapons to cantonments. Recognizing that they may need some help in making the transition from war to peace, the parties asked for a strong, NATO-led force. That is what they are getting and that is what they agreed to in the Dayton peace agreement.

Our troops will take their orders only from the American general who commands NATO and they will have the authority to meet any threat to their safety or any violation of the peace agreement with immediate, decisive force.

When American peacekeepers in Somalia embarked upon what turned out to be an ill-fated mission to apprehend warlord Mohammed Aideed, they lacked the equipment and other elements necessary to ensure success.

From what our military officials have told us, this scenario will not be repeated in Bosnia. Our forces are going in well-trained, well-equipped, heavily armed, and with robust rules of engagement.

I still remain concerned about the potential for so-called mission creep. Under the terms of the peace agreement, I-For has the authority to ''help create secure conditions for the conduct by others of other tasks associated with the peace settlement, including free and fair elections;'' to ''assist the movement of organizations in the accomplishment of humanitarian missions;'' ''to assist the UNHCR and other international organizations in their humanitarian missions;'' to ''observe and prevent interference with the movement of civilian populations, refugees, and displaced persons, and to respond appropriately to deliberate violence to life and person;'' and to ''monitor the clearing of minefields and obstacles.''

True, these are authorities not obligations as Secretary Christopher has pointed out. True, the mission is defined by the NATO plan and these elements are not in the NATO plan, as Secretary Perry told the Foreign Relations Committee.

Nevertheless, these authorities create the potential for expansion of the mission beyond the military tasks cited by administration officials and for increased risk to our troops and those of other nations participating in the operation.

They also create an expectation on the part of the local populations and civilian organizations on the ground that I-For will protect and assist them.

If refugees are being attacked, can our troops really stand by and watch? Would we want them to? If UNHCR ask I-For to help resettle refugees in a given area, will I-For feel compelled to assist? If Catholic Relief Services asks French troops in Sarajevo to protect a convoy of humanitarian aid going into the city, are they bound to assist?

The Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe [OSCE] is responsible for organizing elections in Bosnia in the next year. What expectations does OSCE, or the parties for that matter, have about IFOR's role in this process?

I remain concerned that IFOR's role in assisting the civilian operations that are to occur in the next year is still somewhat ambiguous. I understand that NATO military planners wanted IFOR to have these authorities to avoid the situation U.N. peacekeepers often found themselves in in Bosnia—that is, standing by and watching as terrible atrocities were committed against innocent civilians.

I agree that our soldiers must act if civilians are under attack or directly threatened. However, the operative word in responding to any of these situations must be ''limited.''

IFOR commanders from General Joulwan on down must understand that the American people and Congress will not support a broadened definition of the mission that has American forces serving as the constant protectors of civilian populations. That is not our job; the parties to the agreement must do this by fulfilling the commitments made in the agreement.

Much concern has been expressed in this debate about the exit strategy for American troops. Any exit strategy must be composed of more than a date; it must include criteria to determine whether or not the mission has been successful. I believe that that criteria must be limited solely to the military tasks that IFOR has set out to accomplish.

The civilian tasks that must be undertaken in the next year such as refugee repatriation and resettlement, elections, establishing governmental structures, monitoring human rights, apprehending alleged war criminals, are daunting. They must not become the criteria by which we determine success of the IFOR mission.

The President has stated that the mission which we are asking our troops to undertake will be limited to a year. Undoubtedly during this year, there will be violations of the Dayton agreement.

However, if there is a pattern of violations which indicates that the parties are not truly committed to this agreement, then American forces should be withdrawn. Our soldiers are there to keep the peace, not to fight a war or to prevent a war if the parties want to return once again to being combatants. If it becomes clear as the end of the year approaches, that the duration of the IFOR mission needs to be extended because success is within reach but not yet achieved, the burden of that mission must be shifted away from the United States and more to our European allies.

We must make it clear that we do not intend to stay in Bosnia indefinitely. Bosnia is first and foremost a European problem. If the peace implementation operation must be extended beyond a year, the countries of Europe must be prepared to share more of the responsibility and to replace our forces with theirs as we transition out. In other words, our troops must be out within the limited timeframe the President has set out.

The peace agreement provides for a build-down of the parties' military forces with the goal of achieving military parity by the end of the year, when IFOR is to withdraw. Administration officials have indicated that build-down may not be enough to ensured stability and that the United States will ensure that the Armed Forces of Bosnia and Herzegovina are equipped and trained.

While I agree that military imbalance at the end of a year could be a serious threat to peace, I am concerned about the risk that this process could pose for American forces on the ground. Even though American participants in I-For will not be arming or training Federation forces, they could be targets for Bosnian Serbs who object to the lack of neutrality on the part of the United States.

Beyond the risk factor, it is not at all clear to me, at least, when and

where build down ends and build up begins and who is going to do the building up.

Notwithstanding these concerns, I believe our overall interests in Bosnia warrant the sending of American troops to help keep the peace. Certainly there are risks associated with this operation, but every effort has been made to minimize those risks by ensuring that our forces are well-trained and well-equipped, and that the rules of engagement are robust in order that they may defend themselves against any life-threatening situation.

I recognize that many Americans and indeed some in this body do not believe that we should participate in this mission. As a Vietnam veteran, I know the pain and the difficulty of fighting without the political support of the American people and their representatives.

We are not sending our soldiers to Bosnia to fight a war, but we are asking them to undertake a military mission in the name of peace that is not without risk. No matter what concerns we may have about this endeavor, we owe them our full support. We should demonstrate that support by endorsing the President's decision to send them to Bosnia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, it is for these reasons that I believe we must support the President, but let me say that with caution. This must be limited, limited, limited. It must have a clear strategy that does exit us at the end of the year, and we must define success in the context not of the civilian political success but only in the military separation of the forces and the giving of them the opportunity to make a peace.

I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, what is the remaining order under the unanimous-consent agreement?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has up to 26 minutes.

Mr. MCCAIN. Followed by?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority now has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. MCCAIN. And then the majority leader will speak after that. Is that the unanimous-consent agreement?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no agreement to that effect, but that is the assumption.

Mr. MCCAIN. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, like all other Senators who have spoken today, I wish this debate were not necessary. I agree with those Senators who have said that they would not have undertaken the commitment made by the President of the United States to deploy American ground forces to Bosnia to implement the tenuous peace that now exists there. But that is no longer the central question of our deliberations this evening. The President did so commit and our obligation now goes beyond expressing our disagreement with that decision.

Many of us did disagree, as is abundantly evident by the number of Senators who support the resolution offered by Senators HUTCHISON, INHOFE, NICKLES, and others, yet we all recognize that the President has the authority to make that decision.

The troops are going to Bosnia, and any prospect that Congress could prevent that deployment disappeared in the overwhelming vote in opposition to prohibiting funding for the deployment, the only constitutional means we have to reverse the President's decision.

Our troops are going to Bosnia. Congress should do everything in our power to ensure that our mission is truly clear, limited, and achievable; that it has the greatest for success with the least risk to the lives of our young men and women. That is our responsibility, as much as the President's.

The resolution that the majority leader and I have offered does not ask Senators to support the decision to deploy. It asks that you support the deployment after the decision had been made. It asks you further to condition your support on some important commitments by the President which I will discuss in a moment.

I intend to give that support, and I commend the majority leader for exercising extraordinary leadership in trying to influence both the nature and security of our mission Bosnia as well as the outcome of the peace process there, to which we have made such a profound commitment. I believe Senator DOLE has significantly helped to improve both the security of our forces and the likelihood that the cause they have been asked to serve—peace in Bosnia—will endure beyond the year our forces will be stationed in that troubled country.

He has accomplished these important objectives by securing assurances from the administration that our soldiers will only be expected to perform those tasks for which they are trained, and will not be ill-used in nation-building exercises. Moreover, he has secured the strong commitment from the President that the United States will lead efforts to establish a stable, military balance in Bosnia which is the only undertaking that can be realistically expected to secure a lasting cease-fire there. Those commitments were well worth our efforts, and, again, I am grateful to the distinguished majority leader for his honorable and effective statesmanship in this effort.

Mr. President, what we should all strive to avoid is giving anyone—anyone—in Bosnia the idea that the American people and their elected representatives are so opposed to this deployment that the least provocation—violent provocation—will force the President to withdraw our forces. I do not want a single terrorist, a single Majahidin or Bosnian Serb sniper to think that by killing an American, they can incite a political uproar in America that will compel the President to bring our troops home.

That is my first reason for supporting this deployment. I want our enemies to know that America—not just the American force in Bosnia—but all Americans are in deadly earnest about this deployment. Attacks on the safety of those troops should, and I believe will, be met with a disproportionate response. That response will not include abandoning the mission. We must begin now to impress upon all parties in Bosnia that any assault on the security of our soldiers would amount to nothing more than an act of folly on the part of the assailant.

Mr. President, opponents of the President's decision often claim that there is no vital United States security interest in Bosnia that would justify the risk of American lives to defend. I have long agreed that there was no such interest. But there is now. There are the lives of 20,000 Americans to defend. And anyone who thinks they can achieve their own political ends by threatening our troops should be forcefully disabused of that notion, and should not be encouraged in their action by the misperception that the American people and the U.S. Congress are not united in steadfast support of our troops, their safety, and the mission they are now obligated to undertake.

There are other important American interests involved in this deployment. All the parties to the Dayton agreement have stated unequivocally that should the United States renege on its commitment, the peace will collapse and hostilities will resume. We will then watch Bosnians suffer again the mass murder and atrocities that have repulsed all people of decency and compassion.

Moreover, Mr. President, abjuring our commitment now would do considerable damage to NATO, the most successful defensive alliance in history. Many Americans may wonder why we need to be concerned about NATO in the wake of the Soviet Unions's collapse. But, Mr. President, the world still holds many dangers for our security, and our enemies are far less predictable than they once were. We will need our friends in the future, as much as they need us now.

Lastly, Mr. President, I want to talk about the relationship between the Nation's credibility and the credibility of its chief executive. In an earlier statement on this question, I asked my Republican colleagues to place as high a premium on this President's credibility abroad, as they would place on a Republican President's.

I asked this because the reliability of the President's word is of enormous strategic value to the American people. The President's voice is the voice of America. When the world loses faith in the commitments of our President, all Americans are less safe—and somewhere down the line American vital interests and American lives will be lost.

The credibility and authority of the President of the United States, and the security of American soldiers, compel our support of their deployment. They are vital interests worth defending whatever our current political differences may be with the President.

Again, by supporting the deployment, I do not confer my approval of the decision to deploy. As I have already stated, I would not have committed American ground forces to this mission, had that decision been up to me. But the decision has been made, by the only American elected to make such decisions—the President of the United States. And I have construed my responsibility in these circumstances as requiring my support for efforts to maximize the prospects for success of the mission and minimize its obvious risks.

My support, and the support I urge my colleagues to give this deployment by voting for the resolution before us, has been characterized by the media as grudging. Fair enough. But let me be clear, I do not want to feed the cynicism of the public—or any members of our free press who might succumb to cynicism from time to time—should they conclude that by our resolution, and our votes preceding this one, that we are trying to avoid speaking clearly in support or opposition, and evade any responsibility for our own actions.

I know what I am doing. I know that by supporting this deployment, if not the decision, I must share in the blame if it ends disastrously. I will accept that responsibility—not happily, but honestly, just as Senators who supported the prohibition on funding for the deployment would have had to accept the blame for the problems that would have occurred if they had been successful in preventing the deployment.

The President will be accountable to the families of any American soldier who dies in service to his country in Bosnia. He will have to answer for their loss. But so will I. I fully accept that in my support of the deployment, and my efforts to influence its conduct and its termination, I incur this obligation.

Beyond offering expressions of sorrow and regret, we will have to tell those families that they bear their terrible loss for the sake of the country. Nothing—absolutely nothing—is harder than that. Just contemplating such a responsibility makes me heartsick.

This may be the hardest vote I have cast as a Member of Congress. It may be the hardest vote I will ever cast. To send young men and women into such evident danger is an awful responsibility. I don't envy the President. Nor do I envy the Senate.

I was once on the other end of the relationship between the military and their civilian commanders. I served with brave men who were sent by our leaders into a calamity—a war we would not win. We were ill used by our political leaders then. We were ill used by many of our senior commanders. I saw good men lose their lives, lives that were just squandered for a lost cause that the dying believed in, but that many of the living did not. Their cause was honor, their own and their country's. And they found their honor in their answer, not their summons. I will never forget that. Never. Never.

If I have any private oath that I have tried to abide by in my public service it is that I would never ask Americans to serve in missions where success was not defined, the commitment to achieve it uncertain, and its object of less value than its price.

I pray today that I have kept my oath. I will pray so every night for as long as this mission lasts. I wish the people of Bosnia peace. I wish them peace because they deserve that blessing, but even more importantly because the lives of many fine young Americans have been ransomed to that peace. I know that these Americans will perform magnificently, under very difficult circumstances, to secure the objectives of their mission. They will reflect, as they always do, great credit on themselves and on the United States, as they seek again to secure the peace and security in which another people may secure their rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

Mr. President, I learned about duty, its costs and its honor, from friends who did not come home with me to the country we loved so dearly, and from friends who overcame adversity with far more courage and grace than I possessed. I have tried to see my duty in this question as they would have me see it.

In the difficult decision—and it is difficult for reasons greater and more honorable than political advantage or disadvantage—our sense of duty may lead us to different conclusions. I respect all of my colleagues for seeking to discharge their solemn responsibilities in this matter after careful deliberation and with honest reasoning.

But I want to make one last point to those Americans—and I do not include any of my colleagues in this category—who oppose this deployment and this resolution because they resent the costs of America's leadership in the world. The burdens that are imposed on the United States are greater than the burdens borne by any other nation. There is no use bemoaning that fact or vainly trying to avoid its reality. This reality will be so for as long as we remain the greatest nation on earth. When we arrive at the moment when less is expected from our leadership by the rest of the world, then we will have arrived at the moment of our decline. We should accept that burden with courage. We cannot withdraw from the world into our prosperity and comfort and hope to keep those blessings. We cannot leave the world alone. For the world will not leave us alone.

So I will support this mission, with grave concern and more than a little sadness. I will support my President. I will, I believe, support my country and the men and women we have asked to defend us. I give my full support, whatever my concerns. And I accept, fully, the consequences of what I do her today. I ask my colleagues to do so as well.

I ask all Senators to support the Dole resolution, irrespective of their views over the policy that brought our soldiers to Bosnia. I ask for your vote as an expression of support for the American soldiers who, summoned to duty in Bosnia, will find their honor and ours in their answer. I ask for your vote to help reduce the threats to their welfare, and increase the chances that the cause for which they risk so much may succeed, and endure long after they have come home to a grateful nation.

And I ask God to bless the men and women of the U.S. Armed Forces who will render their Nation this great service; to bless the President; to bless the Congress; and to bless the United States. We are all in great need of His benevolence today.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who seeks recognition? The minority leader is recognized.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, this evening, President Clinton is traveling to Paris to sign the Bosnia peace agreement. The first of 20,000 American troops are on their way to Bosnia to help implement that agreement. And we in the Senate are being asked to make a choice. A choice with profound—even life-and-death—consequences.

Will we give our troops going to Bosnia our full and genuine support? Or will we burden them with the weight of conflicting messages?

In the more than 3½ years since war broke out in the former Yugoslavia, more than a quarter of a million people—including tens of thousands of innocent children—have been killed.

The Bosnian people are weary of war. They have negotiated a peace settlement. They are merely asking us to help them implement it.

Some may ask: Why us? Why must the United States become involved in this ancient conflict? I believe there are three answers.

First, it is in our national interest. Peace and stability in Europe are vital to the United States. Twice in this century, we have seen what horrors can occur when aggression in Europe is allowed to spread unchallenged and unchecked. Twice in this century, Americans have died to keep Europe free of such aggression. To turn our back on Bosnia now, especially after the President has committed American troops, would be to deny what we have learned, and what those earlier generations sacrificed. It would weaken American leadership in NATO. And it would undermine our credibility as a world leader.

Second, we have a moral obligation in Bosnia. For nearly 50 years, we believed that we would never again see concentration camps in Europe. We would never again see men and boys made to dig their own mass graves and then be machine-gunned into them. We were wrong. This is happening in Bosnia, and our national conscience demands that we take a strong stand against it.

In 1948, 3 years after the end of World War II, the French writer and philosopher Albert Camus appealed to the monks of a French monastery to help the children who had been injured and orphaned in that war. ''Perhaps we cannot prevent this world from being a world in which children are tortured,'' Camus said. ''But we can reduce the number of children who are tortured. And if you don't help us, who else in the world can help us do it?''

That brings me to the third reason we must help implement this agreement. The United States must help bring peace to Bosnia because no one else in the world can. The leaders of all three factions—Serbs, Croats, and Moslems—have made it clear that they will not participate in the peace process unless we are involved.

I commend President Clinton and all the members of the negotiating team who worked so hard in Dayton to get us to this point. They accomplished what many said was impossible, and their leadership is already saving lives. Without the commitment of this President to peace in the Balkans, there would be no debate tonight, for we could not be on the verge of peace.

I also want to commend the distinguished majority leader, Senator MCCAIN, Senator NUNN, and all the senators in our Bosnia working group for the leadership they have shown in negotiating a resolution that says unequivocally to our troops, ''We support you.''

That mission will give the Bosnian people an opportunity to build a democratic society. Bosnia-Herzegovina will be preserved as a single State with a unified capital of Sarajevo. The Bosnian people will be allowed to hold free elections, and those who have been driven from their homes through fighting and other forms of terrorism will be free to return.

Our mission is clear, limited, and achievable. We are sending our troops to maintain a ceasefire. They will take their orders from an American general. And they will have full authority to respond to threats to their safety with immediate and overwhelming force.

Again, the critical question is, are we going to give our troops our genuine support as they seek to carry out their mission? Or are we going to burden them with conflicting messages?

Mr. President, I believe the Hutchison amendment is gravely misguided and even dangerous. It claims to support our troops, but, in fact, it undermines them. How can we support our troops if we condemn the mission for which they are risking their lives? Have we learned nothing from our own history?

Sending such a contradictory message would badly undermine the morale of our troops and jeopardize their safety.

It would also undermine U.S. credibility—our commitment to peace, and our commitment to our NATO allies.

Finally, sending such a conflicting and wrong-headed message would undermine the peace agreement itself, and efforts to implement it.

The responsible vote is a vote for the bipartisan resolution offered by the majority leader.

This resolution supports our troops unequivocally. It commends them for their professionalism and patriotism and bravery. It assures that they will have all the resources and authority they need to protect the peace—and protect themselves.

It recognizes the vital interests our Nation has in preventing the spread of the Bosnian conflict and ending the bloodshed. It preserves America's leadership within NATO, and it preserves our credibility with our allies.

And it requires the President to certify two important conditions. First, that the NATO implementation force is limited to implementation of the peace agreement and protection of NATO troops. And second, that the United States objectives in Bosnia are to maintain the peace and establish a military balance that will allow the Bosnian Moslems to defend themselves when NATO withdraws.

As the Senator from Oklahoma noted earlier tonight, the Hutchison/Inhofe and Dole/McCain resolutions are contradictory. The Hutchison resolution, although it is non-binding, sends a dangerous and conflicting message that will undermine and endanger American troops.

The Dole/McCain resolution is binding legislation that asserts Congressional authority and responsibility and sends a clear message that we support our troops and the cause for which they are risking their lives. It is the right thing to do.

To echo the words of Camus, the United States cannot prevent all wars, everywhere. But we can reduce the number of children and adults killed in Bosnia. Our national security, and our national conscience, demand that we try.

Mr. DOLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WARNER). The majority leader is recognized.

DEPLOYMENT OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES IN BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I send my resolution to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 44) concerning the deployment of United States Armed Forces in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. DOLE. That resolution will be the second vote. The first vote will be on the Hutchison resolution.

Mr. President, let me indicate at 10:05 p.m. our time, and 4:05 in the morning in Bosnia, where many Americans are now and where hundreds and thousands more will be on the way, I think we have to understand what we are about to vote on here. We are not voting on a decision to send American troops to Bosnia. That decision has been made. It was made 2 years ago by the President of the United States. Without consulting Congress, the President of the United States made that decision.

So we say to those soldiers who may be on early duty there at 4 a.m. in the morning, in the bitter cold—from those of us in the warmth of the U.S. Senate, free from any danger—we are about to cast a vote. We are about to cast a vote, Sergeant Jones or Private Smith, whoever it is, to indicate that we support your efforts there. They may have some misgivings about why they are there, and we may have some doubts. I listened to the eloquent statement of Senator MCCAIN, and I listened last evening to the final speaker of the evening, Senator COHEN from Maine, but this is not about politics. This is not about a Democratic President and a Republican majority in the U.S. Senate. This is about a lot of frightened young Americans who are in Bosnia, or on their way to Bosnia. I assume they may not have thought of it directly, but I believe they will think of it one of these days; they are going to be looking back to see if they had the support of those who represented them in the Congress of the United States. They may not be thinking of that at 4:10 a.m.

So this is a very difficult debate for Members of Congress. It is a difficult debate because Congress was not part of the decisionmaking with respect to sending troops. Congress was not consulted. Congress was told of the President's commitment to send troops after the commitment was made. And then we were faced with the dilemma of undermining that commitment or acquiescing in a military mission with serious flaws. And make no mistake about it, the President has said he made this decision and he takes responsibility. It was his decision to send troops and his decision alone.

A lot of Members of Congress, some on both sides of the aisle—in fact, 69 of us voted the last time to lift the arms embargo to give the Bosnians an opportunity to defend themselves—which is precisely the reason we are here tonight—so that we would not be sending American troops or making that decision. But the President rejected that. That was bipartisan in the House and

in the Senate. We opposed the arms embargo. As I said, we repeatedly voted to lift it. Some of my colleagues were concerned about that.

We have two resolutions before us tonight. I understand that a number of Senators support the resolution offered by the Senator from Texas; the Senators from Oklahoma, Senator INHOFE and Senator NICKLES; and a number of others. That resolution emphasizes very clearly that we oppose the decision to deploy troops. No doubt about it. We disagree, we oppose. It is his decision, and he said as much as recently as, I think, Sunday on ''60 Minutes.''

However, a vote on this resolution does not provide our troops, who are now in Bosnia at 4:08 in the morning, and the other thousands who will be there tomorrow, or next week, or next month—I think it makes a point, but it does not make a policy. It does not effect a policy. It does not make the job our forces have to do any safer or any easier, nor does it provide a plan to achieve a military balance in Bosnia or increase the chances for successful completion of our mission.

I assume most of our colleagues will vote for that resolution. If they do, I wish they would follow up their signal to President Clinton by voting ''yes'' on the Dole-McCain-Nunn resolution. I want to be clear about what that resolution does and does not do. This resolution does not endorse the President's decision. It does not endorse the agreement reached in Dayton. It does support our men and women in uniform.

It does limit the mission to military tasks only and requires a realistic exit strategy based on the goal of Bosnian self-reliance. To put it simply, President Clinton has a plan to get us into Bosnia; this resolution shows us a way out.

It sets three conditions on the deployment of American forces: No. 1, it limits the mission to implementing military provisions of the accord. No Somalia-style nation building, for example. It insists on an exit strategy linked to military balance so Bosnia can defend itself. Somebody said that is bad policy because if they are armed and trained we may have to stay longer. I do not understand that argument. We have been debating on this floor for 2 years that we ought to arm and train the Bosnians and lift the arms embargo so they can defend themselves. That is precisely what we wish to do here. No. 3 also provides U.S. leadership on an immediate effort to provide Bosnia that means to defend itself. I think if these conditions are met they will help enhance the safety of our forces and assure that they can withdraw in a timely manner and without triggering a resumption of hostilities.

Let us be clear, setting a date is not an exit strategy. In fact, many will argue that if we set a date nothing will happen until that date expires, and then hostilities will recur.

I suggest that I think we have been able to perform a valuable service here for our colleagues regardless of their feelings about the decision. I did not agree with it. You do not agree with it—maybe some do agree with the decision. The decision has been made. The deployment started. Our goal should be a Bosnia that is self-reliant, able to defend itself without depending on the United States or any outside force.

I want to emphasize just a few points on this critical issue. First, the word ''lead'' is essential. Without U.S. leadership, this will not happen. Leading does not mean going it alone but it does mean acting like the sole remaining superpower. Second, our language makes it clear that the efforts to arm and train will take place separate and apart from NATO, IFOR; no United States military forces in NATO operation will be involved enabling Bosnia to defend itself. Finally, this resolution states that the Bosnians should be provided with assistance of the highest possible quality—American where necessary—and that of other countries when sufficient.

I also point out this resolution requires the President report extensively on his plan to enable Bosnia to provide for its own defense and on all aspects of the military and civilian aspects of the operation.

I want to say a few words about Senator MCCAIN and his leadership on national security issues. From his sacrifice during Vietnam—and I know I was not standing here; I was not in leadership, I was standing back there somewhere. I was wearing a JOHN MCCAIN bracelet, proudly—a POW bracelet—and arguing with my Democratic colleagues on the other side not to cut off funding in the Vietnam war. I led debate on this floor for 7 weeks in an effort to derail those who would cut off funding while JOHN MCCAIN was in a little box over there in prison and there were thousands like him and thousands and thousands of Americans.

The theory was just cut off funding. The war will end. That is not the way it works.

So JOHN MCCAIN came back, others came back, and others did not come back as Senator MCCAIN said earlier. Then he became a freshman Congressman and opposed the deployment in Lebanon in 1983. It seems to me, not that I have any more insight than anybody else in this body, but there is something about a relationship that you build up in the service and you understand one thing: How important support is from America—whether it is your family, whether it is your little hometown, whether it is your State, whether it is the Congress of the United States.

I say to Senator MCCAIN and many others who were prisoners of war in Vietnam, no one works any harder on the issues of war and peace. I did not agree with Senator MCCAIN on normalizing relations with Vietnam, but he was there and I was not. No one takes his responsibility more seriously. We could not have reached this agreement without his almost minute-by-minute involvement.

Let me say one other thing about leadership: It is not easy. The easiest vote is no, no, no. I recall being on the floor in this position in January 1991, the 10th, 11th, and 12th, when we had troops in the gulf. President Bush had decided to come to Congress and ask for support. I remember at the time we had a very good debate—3 days of it—Democrats and Republicans, and I do not question anybody's motives. The thing that struck me as I looked at it at the time and as I look back at it now, not a single member of the Democratic leadership in the House or the Senate would stand up on this floor or the House floor and support President Bush. They did not have to agree with President Bush. I do not agree with President Clinton. But the troops were there. I thought that was a tragic mistake. You pay a price for leadership. Some will have short-term political gain and some just truly feel we should not be doing anything and that the only vote is no.

I ask my colleagues, it is now 17 after 4 o'clock a.m. in Bosnia, and Americans are there, so if we cut off funding this morning, I do not know what would have happened. If we pass the Hutchison resolution, I do not know what will happen. I hope if we pass the Dole-McCain-Nunn, et al., resolution that we will have provided an exit strategy, a way to extricate Americans by arming and training Bosnians, so that they can be an independent force and so we can go home, so that those Americans who are there today at 18 after 4 o'clock a.m. in the morning will not be there next Christmas.

That is what this debate is all about. It is not easy. I have had a lot of mail, a lot of phone calls, from a lot of people, who I do not think understand the issue. The issue we are voting on tonight is not a decision to send American troops. Let me conclude with that. We can posture and complain about the President's decision. I do not like it. He knows I do not like it. I told him I do not like it. I said publicly I do not like it. If we had our way, we would have lifted the embargo and we would not be talking about sending troops. That is our argument. I think it would have been correct.

I guess our decision is whether we are going to send a message to all the families in America, to all the troops who are on the way to Bosnia, plus all the other American forces who someday may be engaged in some conflict, because we do have a responsibility from time to time. They will ask themselves, do we have the support of the American people, of our families and of our representatives? I think that is what this debate is all about. I hope that is how it is received by the people who watch or listen or read the RECORD or listen to each other.

I ask my colleagues to think very carefully. We are going to be debating this. I assume this is just the first debate. A month from now, 2 months

from now, 3 months from now, 4 months from now, something happens, there will be other debates and other efforts made. But this is the important, this is the first step. This is a signal to the American forces that we support you. We support you, as we should.

Finally, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an exchange I have had with the President on his assurances that the Bosnians will be provided with arms and the training they need. I think the letters are very important. It is part of the legislative history, because the President has given his word that that training will be provided and arms will be furnished. And, again, that is very important. It may be lost on someone now, but it is going to be very important not a year from now, as the Senator from Maine said last night, 9 months from now, 9 months from now is when it starts. If they are not trained, and if we have to wait 6 months, it may be lost.

So, it is up to us. If not now, when? This is the time to support American forces.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, DC., December 10, 1995.

DEAR MR. LEADER: I want to set forth for you the Administration's policy with respect to military stabilization measures in Bosnia.

The Bosnian Serb advantage in heavy weapons relative to the defense capability of the Bosnian Federation has been a major reason for the fighting in Bosnia and remains a potential source of instability. We believe that establishing a stable military balance within Bosnia by the time IFOR leaves is important to preventing the war from resuming and to facilitate IFOR's departure.

The Dayton Agreement has strong arms control provisions which provide for a ''build-down'' of forces. We intend to pursue these vigorously. An arms restraint regime obviously can help contribute to a stable balance.

Even with arms control, we anticipate there will be a deficiency on the part of the Federation. Accordingly, we have made a commitment to the Bosnian Federation that we will coordinate an international effort to ensure that the Federation receives the assistance necessary to achieve an adequate military balance when IFOR leaves.

Because we want to assure the impartiality of IFOR, providing arms and training to Federation forces will not be done by either IFOR or U.S. military fordes. The approach we intend to pursue is for the U.S. to coordinate the efforts of third countries.

Our efforts in this connection already have begun. An assessment team to evaluate the needs of the Federation has just returned from Bosnia. We will proceed with this effort in a manner that is consistent with the UN resolution lifting the arms embargo and the relevant Dayton Agreement provisions, which allow planning and training to proceed, but restrict actual transfers during the initial six months, in particular of all arms for 90 days, and heavy weapons for 180 days, after the Agreement enters into force.

Sincerely,

BILL CLINTON.

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC, December 12, 1995.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We are writing to seek clarification on several critical issues raised in your December 10 letter regarding your administration's policy on arming and training Bosnian Federation forces. In our view, it is essential to clarify these matters—which are integral to the U.S. exit strategy—prior to moving forward with Senate consideration of your administration's decision to send U.S. ground forces to implement the Dayton agreement.

You acknowledge the Bosnian Serb military advantage and the need to establish a stable military balance within Bosnia by the time the NATO Implementation Force (IFOR) leaves. In your address to the nation, you justified American participation in IFOR by stating the need for American leadership. However, your letter does not indicate that the United States will lead in the critical effort of ensuring the Bosnians can defend themselves. We are seeking your confirmation that the United States will lead in coordinating and providing the Bosnians with the means for self-defense. Without an American-led effort to rapidly provide the Bosnians with the best possible quality arms, equipment, and training, we believe that the Bosnians will not be able to adequately defend themselves within a year.

Also in this regard, while we understand that the arming and training program should be conducted separately from the IFOR peacekeeping operation, to state that no U.S. military forces will be involved—as your letter does—is a guarantee that such a program will be wholly ineffective and may not even occur. A strict prohibition on all U.S. military involvement outside the territory of Bosnia would severely cripple American efforts to ensure that the Bosnians are provided with the weapons and training they need. Military planning, coordination, information-sharing, or even Bosnian participation in the International Military Education and Training (IMET) could not occur under such a prohibition. It seems that so severely limiting our flexibility would not be in our national interest.

Finally, we urge you to focus on what the United States can do, rather than what we cannot do under the U.N. Security Council resolution lifting the arms embargo. For example, training can begin immediately—presumably outside of Bosnia. Also, an array of defensive weapons could be provided to Bosnian Federation forces on day 91 consistent with the U.N. resolution—as could any weapon not classified as ''heavy'' under the terms of the U.N. resolution.

We hope that you will clarify these matters as soon as possible so that we may proceed with consideration of the Dole-McCain resolution.

Sincerely,

BOB DOLE.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, DC, December 12, 1995.

DEAR MR. LEADER: I am writing in response to your December 12 letter on equip and train. You raise several questions to which I would like to respond.

First of all, the United States will take a leadership role in coordinating an international effort to ensure that the Bosnian Federation receives the assistance necessary to achieve an adequate military balance when IFOR leaves. As in all things related to our effort to bringing peace to the region, U.S. leadership has been critical.

As I stated in my December 10 letter to you, I want to assure the impartiality of IFOR. In the view of my military advisors, this requires minimizing the involvement of U.S. military personnel. But we expect that some individual military officers, for example, working in OSD, DSAA or other agencies, will be involved in planning this effort. We also will offer the Bosnians participation in U.S. programs such as IMET. I agree that maintaining flexibility is important to the success of the effort to achieve a stable military balance within Bosnia. But I will do nothing that I believe will endanger the safety of American troops on the ground in Bosnia. I am sure you will agree that is my primary responsibility.

I want to assure you that I am focusing on what the United States can do. That is why I sent an assessment team to the region to properly evaluate the needs of the Federation. Training programs and provision of non-lethal assistance can begin immediately after the peace agreement enters into force; and provision of small arms can begin after three months. We intend to move expeditiously.

I have given you my word that we will make certain that the Bosnian Federation will receive the assistance necessary to achieve an adequate military balance when IFOR leaves. I intend to keep it.

Sincerely,

BILL CLINTON.

EXPRESSING OPPOSITION OF CONGRESS TO PRESIDENT CLINTON'S PLANNED DEPLOYMENT OF GROUND FORCES IN BOSNIA

The Senate continued with the consideration of the concurrent resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question occurs on agreeing to Senate Concurrent Resolution 35.

The yeas and nays have not been ordered.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced, yeas 47, nays 52, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 602 Leg.]

YEAS—47

Abraham	Feingold	McConnell
Ashcroft	Frist	Murkowski
Bennett	Gorton	Nickles
Bond	Gramm	Pressler
Brown	Grams	Santorum
Burns	Grassley	Shelby
Campbell	Gregg	Simpson
Coats	Hatch	Smith
Cochran	Hatfield	Snowe
Cohen	Helms	Specter
Coverdell	Hutchison	Stevens
Craig	Inhofe	Thomas
D'Amato	Kempthorne	Thompson
Dole	Kyl	Thurmond
Domenici	Lott	Warner
Faircloth	Mack	

NAYS—52

Akaka	Daschle	Inouye
Baucus	DeWine	Jeffords
Biden	Dodd	Johnston
Bingaman	Dorgan	Kassebaum
Boxer	Exon	Kennedy
Bradley	Feinstein	Kerrey
Breaux	Ford	Kerry
Bryan	Glenn	Kohl
Bumpers	Graham	Lautenberg
Byrd	Harkin	Leahy
Chafee	Heflin	Levin
Conrad	Hollings	Lieberman

Lugar	Nunn	Roth
McCain	Pell	Sarbanes
Mikulski	Pryor	Simon
Moseley-Braun	Reid	Wellstone
Moynihan	Robb	
Murray	Rockefeller	

So the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 35) was rejected.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. LEAHY. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

DEPLOYMENT OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES IN BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA

The Senate continued with the consideration of the joint resolution

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 44.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 69, nays 30, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 603 Leg.]

YEAS—69

Abraham	Dorgan	Lieberman
Akaka	Exon	Lugar
Baucus	Feinstein	Mack
Bennett	Ford	McCain
Biden	Glenn	McConnell
Bingaman	Gorton	Mikulski
Bond	Graham	Moseley-Braun
Boxer	Harkin	Moynihan
Bradley	Hatch	Murkowski
Breaux	Heflin	Murray
Bryan	Hollings	Nunn
Bumpers	Inouye	Pell
Burns	Jeffords	Pryor
Byrd	Johnston	Reid
Campbell	Kassebaum	Robb
Chafee	Kempthorne	Rockefeller
Cochran	Kennedy	Roth
Cohen	Kerrey	Sarbanes
Conrad	Kerry	Simon
Daschle	Kohl	Simpson
DeWine	Lautenberg	Specter
Dodd	Leahy	Stevens
Dole	Levin	Wellstone

NAYS—30

Ashcroft	Gramm	Nickles
Brown	Grams	Pressler
Coats	Grassley	Santorum
Coverdell	Gregg	Shelby
Craig	Hatfield	Smith
D'Amato	Helms	Snowe
Domenici	Hutchison	Thomas
Faircloth	Inhofe	Thompson
Feingold	Kyl	Thurmond
Frist	Lott	Warner

So the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 44) was passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

The joint resolution, with its preamble, is as follows:

S.J. RES. 44

Whereas beginning on February 24, 1993, President Clinton committed the United States to participate in implementing a peace agreement in Bosnia and Herzegovina without prior consultation with Congress;

Whereas the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina has been unjustly denied the means to defend itself through the imposition of a United Nations arms embargo;

Whereas the United Nations Charter restates the ''the inherent right of individual and collective self-defense,'' a right denied the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina whose population has further suffered egregious violations of the international law of war including ethnic cleansing by Serbian aggressors, and the Convention on Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, to which the United States Senate gave its advice and consent in 1986;

Whereas the United States Congress has repeatedly voted to end the United States participation in the international arms embargo on the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina as the best way to achieve a military balance and a just and stable peace without the deployment of United States Armed Forces in Bosnia and Herzegovina;

Whereas the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Republic of Croatia, and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia initialed the General Framework Agreement and Associated Annexes on November 21, 1995 in Dayton, Ohio, after repeated assurances that the United States would send troops to assist in implementing that agreement;

Whereas three dedicated American deplomats—Bob Frasure, Joe Kruzel, and Nelson Drew—lost their lives in the American-led diplomatic effort which culminated in the General Framework Agreement;

Whereas as part of the negotiations which led to the General Framework Agreement, the United States has made a commitment to ensure that the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina is armed and trained to provide for its own defense, and that commitment should be honored;

Whereas the mission of the NATO Implementation Force is to create a secure environment to provide Bosnia and Herzegovina an opportunity to begin to establish a durable peace, which requires the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina to be able to provide for its own defense;

Whereas the objective of the United States in deploying United States Armed Forces to Bosnia and Herzegovina can only be successful if the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina is armed and trained to provide for its own defense after the withdrawal of the NATO Implementation Force and the United States Armed Forces; and

Whereas in deciding to participate in implementation of the General Framework Agreement in Bosnia and Herzegovina, President Clinton has cited American interests including maintaining its leadership in NATO, preventing the spread of the conflict, stopping the tragic loss of life, and fulfilling American commitments;

Whereas on December 3, 1995, President Clinton approved Operation Joint Endeavor and deployment of United States Armed Forces to Bosnia and Herzegovina began immediately thereafter: Now therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SUPPORT FOR UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES.

The Congress unequivocally supports the men and women of our Armed Forces who are carrying out their missions in support of peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina with professional excellence, dedicated patriotism and exemplary bravery, and believes they must be given all necessary resources and support to carry out their mission and ensure their security.

SEC. 2. DEPLOYMENT OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES.

(a) Notwithstanding reservations expressed about President Clinton's decision to deploy United States Armed Forces to Bosnia and Herzegovina and recognizing that:

(1) the President has decided to deploy United States Armed Forces to implement the General Framework Agreement in Operation Joint Endeavor citing American interests in preventing the spread of conflict, maintaining its leadership in NATO, stopping the tragic loss of life, and fulfilling American commitments;

(2) the deployment of United States Armed Forces has begun; and

(3) preserving United States credibility is a strategic interest, the President may only fulfill his commitment to deploy United States Armed Forces in Bosnia and Herzegovina for approximately one year to implement the General Framework Agreement and Military Annex, pursuant to this Resolution, subject to the conditions in subsection (b).

(b) REQUIREMENT FOR DETERMINATION.—Before acting pursuant to this Resolution, the President shall make available to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate, his determination that—

(1) the mission of the NATO Implementation Force and United States Armed Forces deployed in Bosnia and Herzegovina will be limited to implementation of the military provisions of the Military Annex to the General Framework Agreement and measures deemed necessary to protect the safety of the NATO Implementation Force and United States Armed Forces;

(2) an integral part of the successful accomplishment of the U.S. objective in Bosnia and Herzegovina in deploying and withdrawing United States Armed Forces is the establishment of a military balance which enables the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina to provide for its own defense without depending on U.S. or other outside forces; and

(3) the United States will lead an immediate international effort, separate and apart from the NATO Implementation Force and consistent with United Nations Security Council Resolution 1021 and the General Framework Agreement and Associated Annexes, to provide equipment, arms, training and related logistics assistance of the highest possible quality to ensure the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina can provide for its own defense, including, as necessary, using existing military drawdown authorities and requesting such additional authority as may be necessary.

SEC. 3. REPORT ON EFFORTS TO ENABLE THE FEDERATION OF BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA TO PROVIDE FOR ITS OWN DEFENSE.

Within 30 days after enactment, the President shall submit a detailed report on his plan to assist the Federation of Bosnia to provide for its own defense, including the role of the United States and other countries in providing such assistance. Such report shall include an evaluation of the defense needs of the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, including, to the maximum extent possible:

(a) the types and quantities of arms, spare parts, and logistics support required to establish a stable military balance prior to the withdrawal of United States Armed Forces;

(b) the nature and scope of training to be provided;

(c) a detailed description of the past, present and future U.S. role in ensuring that the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina is provided as rapidly as possible with equipment, training, arms and related logistic assistance of the highest possible quality;

(d) administration plans to use existing military drawdown authority, and other assistance authorities pursuant to section 2(b)(3); and

(e) specific or anticipated commitments by third countries to provide arms, equipment or training to the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The report shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

SEC. 4. REPORTS TO CONGRESS ON MILITARY ASPECTS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF THE GENERAL FRAMEWORK AGREEMENT.

(a) Thirty days after enactment, and at least once every 60 days thereafter, the President shall submit to the Congress a report on the status of the deployment of United States Armed Forces in Bosnia and Herzegovina, including a detailed description of:

(1) criteria for determining success for the deployment;

(2) the military mission and objectives;

(3) milestones for measuring progress in achieving the mission and objectives;

(4) command arrangements for United States Armed Forces;

(5) the rules of engagement for United States Armed Forces;

(6) the multilateral composition of forces in Bosnia and Herzegovina;

(7) the status of compliance by all parties with the General Framework Agreement and associated Annexes, including Article III of Annex 1–A concerning the withdrawal of foreign forces from Bosnia and Herzegovina;

(8) all incremental costs of the Department of Defense and any costs incurred by other federal agencies, for the deployment of United States Armed Forces in Bosnia and Herzegovina, including support for the NATO Implementation Force;

(9) the exit strategy to provide for complete withdrawal of United States Armed Forces in the NATO Implementation Force, including an estimated date of completion; and

(10) a description of progress toward enabling the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina to provide for its own defense.

(b) Such reports shall include a description of any changes in the areas listed in (a)(1) through (a)(10) since the previous report, if applicable, and shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

SEC. 5. REPORTS TO CONGRESS ON NON-MILITARY ASPECTS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF THE GENERAL FRAMEWORK AGREEMENT.

Thirty days after enactment, and at least once every 60 days thereafter, the President shall submit to the Congress a report on:

(a) the status of implementation of non-military aspects of the General Framework Agreement and Associated annexes, especially Annex 10 on Civilian Implementation, and of efforts, which are separate from the Implementation Force, by the United States and other countries to support implementation of the non-military aspects. Such report shall include a detailed description of:

(1) progress toward conducting of elections;

(2) the status of return of refugees and displaced persons;

(3) humanitarian and reconstruction efforts;

(4) police training and related civilian security efforts, including the status of implementation of Annex 11 regarding an international police task force; and

(5) implementation of Article XIII of Annex 6 concerning cooperation with the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia and other appropriate organizations in the investigation and prosecution of war crimes and other violations of international humanitarian law;

(b) the status of coordination between the High Representative and the Implementation Force Commander;

(c) the status of plans and preparation for the continuation of civilian activities after the withdrawal of the Implementation Force;

(d) all costs incurred by all U.S. government agencies for reconstruction, refugee, humanitarian, and all other non-military bilateral and multilateral assistance in Bosnia and Herzegovina; and

(e) U.S. and international diplomatic efforts to contain and end conflict in the former Yugoslavia, including efforts to resolve the status of Kosova and halt violations of internationally-recognized human rights of its majority Albanian population.

Such reports shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. DASCHLE. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, let me thank all of my colleagues, as I have indicated before.

On tomorrow, we will take up the Interior conference report, with 6 hours of debate. We will start that at 10:30 a.m. From 9:30 to 10:30, we will have a period for the transaction of morning business.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business with members permitted to speak therein for up to 5 minutes each.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SENIOR CITIZEN FREEDOM TO WORK ACT

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I am pleased to introduce the Senior Citizens' Freedom to Work Act with my colleagues, Senators MCCAIN and ROTH.

This bill would provide long overdue relief for our senior citizens. It would remove a significant impediment that deters seniors from continuing to work. Under the bill, seniors could earn up to $30,000 by the year 2002 without affecting their Social Security benefits.

I intend to work for enactment of the legislation this year to begin immediately lifting the unreasonably low earnings limit. We will phase in the increase over the next 7 years from the current level of $11,280 to $30,000.

This legislation is important for the economy. Continuation of the current policy, which does not utilize the experience and productivity of our seniors, is wasteful and short-sighted.

This legislation is also important for the protection of the Social Security and Medicare trust funds. The bill clarifies that the Secretary of the Treasury is not authorized to under invest and/or disinvest Social Security and Medicare trust fund monies in Federal securities or obligations in order to avoid the limitations on the public debt.

I urge my colleagues in the Senate to support this effort. Specifically, I urge my colleagues on the Finance Committee to join with me to report the bill out of committee tomorrow.

THE NEW READY OR NOT PROGRAM TO COMBAT UNDERAGE DRINKING

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, every day in Congress, we tackle some of the most pressing problems facing our nation. But sometimes, the best solutions don't come from the Capitol. They come from homes and schools and community organizations that you find in every town and city, all across the country. That's what a new program called ''Ready or Not: Talking with Kids About Alcohol,'' is all about.

If you have kids, you know that telling them to ''just say no'' to alcohol doesn't always work. Kids want to know why they should say no. ''Ready or Not'' is a new video educational program that's designed to help parents and other adult supervisors answer that question for kids between the ages of 10 and 14.

''Ready or Not'' is a joint effort of the Boys & Girls Clubs of America and the Century Council, an organization funded by the alcohol industry. It was introduced just after Thanksgiving, and it's already making an impact. I want to congratulate the Boys and Girls Club and the Century Council for all the time and energy they've invested in this important program.

I also want to commend my 36 colleagues in the House and Senate who have joined me in officially endorsing this life-saving project.

A recent survey of America's pre-teens—pre-teens—shows that about four in 10 expect to have problems handling situations involving the use of alcohol. Another survey by the University of Michigan found that, in 1994, more than a quarter of America's eighth-graders reported drinking alcohol in the last month. And, more and more kids are becoming ''binge drinkers.''

We know from our experience in combating teen smoking that if you reach kids early and tell them the truth, they're far more likely to make good decisions about their health. ''Ready or Not'' will help us replicate that success, we hope, with teen drinking.

There are two reasons that ''Ready or Not'' targets kids between the ages of 10 and 14. First, that's when many ''problem drinkers'' first start experimenting with alcohol. Second, and more important, parents and other adults still have a lot of influence over kids at that age. With the help of ''Ready or Not,'' we can reach kids who are in danger of abusing alcohol, and prevent problems before they start.

The last thing a developing mind and body needs is to be stunted with alcohol. ''Ready or Not'' will help parents and teachers and other adults make that case convincingly to America's young people. It fills a critical need, and I'm proud to lend my name to help support it.

SHOULD THERE BE FEDERAL FARM PROGRAMS?

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, for the past decade most of the debate on farm programs has centered around only one question:

''How much should we spend on farm programs?''

Four months ago, I took to the floor to address this issue and noted that the debate has shifted to whether there should be any programs that provide benefits to farmers.

Now, the Republican majority has reported a bill that again only answers the ''how much'' question. It will give $55 billion of the taxpayers funds to farmers over the next 7 years.

The fundamental question is not answered. Should there be farm programs at all?

Farm programs have never been welfare programs.

They have been a contract with the American people.

Here is a copy of the contract that the farmers signs each year with the American taxpayer.

No farmer is required to sign this contract. Each farmer signs voluntarily.

HISTORICAL RATIONALE FOR FARM PROGRAMS

Historically, the contract was a ''price and production stabilization'' contract—as it says here at the top of this document. The taxpayers paid farmers to set land aside in order to stabilize consumer prices as well as stabilizing farm income.

In 1985, the Republican Senate added a new term to that contract. Farmers were also paid to be stewards of the land. Again, no farmer was required to become a land steward—to be a good neighbor. Each farmer made that decision voluntarily.

Now, the Republican budget farm bill changes the terms of the farm contract. It no longer offers American farmers a ''price and production stabilization'' contract. Thus, for the $35 billion the taxpayers give farmers over the next 7 years, consumers get no price stability benefit.

Do I mourn the loss of a farmer-taxpayer contract based on a price stabilization rationale?

No, I do not. At one time regulations that required farmers to manage supplies also helped stabilize some food prices. By and large, there is no longer much, if any, consumer benefit from the supply management aspects of farm programs. Today, supply management programs function only to control the budgetary costs of the program.

This history brings us back to the basic question. Should there be any Federal farm programs?

UNIQUE NATURAL RESOURCE CHALLENGES

The answer is yes. For one overriding reason. It is this. Only farmers can give the American people what they want from private lands.

Let me put it very simply. Americans cannot get the environmental benefits they want unless farmers and ranchers are active willing land stewards.

Before we reviewed a little history—now a little—or should I say—a lot of geography. Farms and grazing lands make up 50 percent of the continental United States.

Let me say that again—Farmers and ranchers own or manage 50 percent of the continental United States.

It is impossible to successfully regulate such a vast area—even if one wanted to—which I do not. To successfully protect and enhance natural resource values on private lands, farmers must be a willing part of the solution.

The 1985 and the 1990 farm bills show that the taxpayers are willing to pay farmers to protect drinking water, cleanup lakes and rivers, and to be stewards of the soil.

As the executive director of the National Rifle Association states, ''Congress has had the foresight to create these unique mechanisms which wed agricultural goals with conservation goals.'' For example, no longer were farmers paid to destroy wetlands. Instead, farm programs began to protect wetlands.

Today, some farm groups favor destroying his harmony. They even go so far as to say that farm conservation should only be funded if there is any money left after farm subsidies and exports subsidies are paid for.

It does not make sense to the public. There is no reason a farmer should be richer than a machine shop owner, even though there is a rationale for farmers being protected from unexpected market shifts.

So this is the time for testing.

It comes down to this question—Is this Republican package the beginning of the end of farm programs, the last 7 years of ''market transition payments,'' or is it a new beginning for farm programs—which builds on the stewardship contract that the American farmer made with the American people beginning in 1985.

In 1990, as chairman, I confirmed and deepened the land stewardship contract between farmers and the American public. One of my proudest moments as chairman was when I stood in the White House while the President praised the 1990 farm bill as ''one of the most important environmental legislative accomplishments of his Presidency.''

But the Republican budget package leaves the basic question unanswered. The Republican proposal says that it will continue to make ''adherence to existing conservation compliance and wetland protection regulations'' a condition of receiving farm payments. It also launches a new program, the ''Livestock Environmental Assistance Program'' which provides the same kind of financial assistance to livestock farmers and ranchers that crop farmers have received. It is a great idea—of which I am the proud author. This press release seems to affirm and expand the stewardship contract of the 1985 and 1990 farm bills.

But, the Republican agricultural leaders have also called for dropping the wetlands protection contract term in the farmers contract with the American taxpayer.

So what is real?—the press release or their legislation?

The Republicans are not being straight with either the taxpayers or the farmers.

If the Republicans tear up the contract between the farmers and the American people—then the Freedom to Farm contract is a one way contract in which the taxpayers will pay $35 billion to farmers for the next 7 years and the taxpayers will get nothing in return.

It will be just a welfare payment—for a group of Americans whose income is seven times higher than a typical family on food stamps.

CONCLUSION

Wallace Stevens once wrote: ''After the final 'no' there comes a 'yes,' and on that 'yes' the future of the world depends * * *.''

Saying no to failed policies of the past makes all the sense in the world. Saying yes to a stewardship contract between the American taxpayer and the American farmer is the only future on which the farmer and the taxpayer can depend.

CHANGE OF VOTE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, on rollcall No. 598 I voted yea. It was my intention to vote nay. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent I be permitted to change my vote. This will in no way change the outcome of the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SIOUX FALLS, SD: ENTREPRENEURIAL HOT SPOT

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I want to take a moment today to commend the hardworking people of South Dakota for making Sioux Falls—South Dakota's largest metropolitan area—the sixth most successful entrepreneurial spot in the country. I am proud to say the pioneer spirit still thrives in South Dakota.

Mr. President, it is not Fortune 500 companies alone that form our country's economic base. Rather, the hard work and dedication of self-employed entrepreneurs and small business owners are responsible for much of our Nation's economic activity. The business of South Dakota is small business, from the family farm to the corner drug store. I am proud to represent such an ambitious and successful constituency—people who are willing to work hard in order to get ahead.

Some South Dakota small businesses have grown to become regional and national success stories. A prime example of entrepreneurial spirit in action is Gateway 2000, a mail order personal computer (PC) corporation started 10 years ago in a farmhouse. Because of South Dakota's excellent business climate and a solid work ethic, Gateway 2000 has become the tri-state metropolitan area's second largest employer and the largest mail-order PC vendor in the United States. Gateway 2000 is a testimonial to what can be achieved with a vision and a strong work ethic.

When I travel home to South Dakota, I always marvel at the continued development my home State has undergone. Entrepreneurial South Dakotans have helped South Dakota evolve into a diverse industrial breadbasket. Now, with the designation of Sioux Falls, SD, as an international port-of-entry, the success of South Dakota will extend to new markets around the world. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a recent article from the Sioux Falls Argus Leader which details South Dakota's economic boom. I am sure all who read it will be impressed with South Dakota's recent surge of economic development.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ENTREPRENEURIAL SPIRIT CITED IN CITY'S HIGH RATING

(By Brenda Wade Schmidt)

Sioux Falls' ranking as the sixth best hot spot for entrepreneurs shows that programs to help business people get started are working, two economic development experts said Wednesday.

The city moved up 26 spots among small metropolitan areas over last year's ranking done by Cognetics Inc. of Cambridge, Mass.

Las Vegas, Nev., was in the top spot of the 134 areas for the second year in a row.

''It could be an indication that the entrepreneurial-type programs are starting to take effect a little bit,'' said Dan Scott, president of the Sioux Falls Development Foundation. ''That spirit still exists here.''

There are so many entrepreneurs that agencies aren't able to help them all, Scott said. Many people come with business ideas but lack the planning and finances to implement their dream.

The Small Business Development Center, with offices across the state, assists many businesses.

''We see the entrepreneurial spirit as being alive and well because of the number of people that come to us for assistance,'' said Bob Ashley, state director. ''Starting a business is hard work. Hard work is not a stranger to the people of South Dakota.''

Scott said the increase probably is the result of two improvements.

''The entrepreneurs are getting more help, and financing has become more readily available,'' he said. ''What keeps most entrepreneurs out of business is the inability to attract financing.

Among rural areas, South Dakota ranked 61st out of 89 places, up five spots from last year.

TRIBUTE TO REV. RICHARD C. HALVERSON

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, today the Senate is holding a memorial service to remember Rev. Richard C. Halverson, our friend and our Chaplain from 1981 to March of this year, who passed away two weeks ago after a long illness. To each of us, whatever our individual religious beliefs, Reverend Halverson was someone special. To some of us, he was a confidant; to others, a counselor; and to still others, a pastor in the more traditional sense of the word. To each of us, he was a friend.

The Senate is, in many ways, a small community with many of the same dynamics inherent in small communities across our Nation. We work in close quarters and all know each other very well. Each of us have forged great friendships here, and each of us has seen great rivalries develop among colleagues. We are all public figures whose lives are all too often an open book. We come from widely different backgrounds, and each of us brings to the Senate a different set of values we hold dearly and ideals to which we are firmly and determinedly committed. And out of all of that, out of all the differing backgrounds and competing philosophies, out of the individual strengths and weaknesses, and out of the personal friendships and political rivalries, this community of one hundred men and women must produce public policy that ensures the well-being of more than two hundred and fifty million of our fellow Americans. That is an awesome responsibility.

As much as any of us, Reverend Halverson understood both the sense of community and the awesome responsibility of the Senate. Each morning, in his opening prayer, he would try to remind us that the sense of community, collegiality, and comity that has always been the trademark of this body is vitally important to carrying out the tasks that are demanded of us. He would remind us that the Senator on the other side of a heated debate is just as committed a public servant as we are. That no political party has a monopoly on compassion, or patriotism, or integrity. That the American Dream is neither conservative nor liberal. And that at the end of the day that sense of community, as Senators and as Americans, must prevail if we are to meet the responsibilities that have been entrusted to us.

Reverend Halverson understood that as Senators, our lives—official and often personal—are open to more scrutiny than most Americans would tolerate. He understood that not only our votes and our speeches, but our families and our lifestyles are often open to public review. As public officials we have accepted that. Nonetheless, Reverend Halverson understood that that scrutiny does take a human toll, reminding us that as we would like to be treated with understanding, so we must be understanding ourselves. And reminding us that for all of the public scrutiny of our lives and our conduct, for all of the public criticism that we sometimes receive for our votes and our political and philosophical beliefs, for all of the questioning of our motives that we must sometimes endure, the work that we do is so important to so many people that we must persevere.

Reverend Halverson always understood that election to public office does not take away the pressures that face every other American man and woman; work-related stress, family concerns, health concerns, or the self-questioning that every individual faces from time to time throughout their lives. Similarly, he understood that election to public office does not bestow skills or talents that we did not possess before; nor does it eradicate any personal weaknesses we possessed before our election. But Reverend Halverson was always there to remind us that deep within each of us is the ability to meet every challenge that our careers and our lives present.

A few years ago, I was quite ill. I left here one February night with a headache and did not return until late in the summer. During those months, as he was during all of his 14 years here, Reverend Halverson was there for me. I have never forgotten that, and my family has never forgotten that.

Throughout his 14 years as the Senate Chaplain Rev. Richard C. Halverson was a committed public servant and a friend to each of us. We shall miss him.

THE BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, almost 4 years ago I commenced these daily reports to the Senate to make a matter of record the exact Federal debt as of close of business the previous day.

In that report (February 27, 1992) the federal debt stood at $3,825,891,293,066.80, as of close of business the previous day. The point is, the federal debt has increased by $1,162,547,561,447.99 since February 26, 1992.

As of the close of business Tuesday, December 12, the Federal debt stood at exactly $4,988,438,854,514.79. On a per capita basis, every man, woman, and child in America owes $18,936.20 as his or her share of the Federal debt.

THE PHOENIX PROPOSAL

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, the Federal Communications Commission will soon rule on Sprint's partnership with Deutsche Telekom and France Telecom, or its more common name, the Phoenix Proposal. I ask unanimous consent that my letter to FCC Chairman Reed Hundt regarding this issue be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC, December 12, 1995.

Hon. REED HUNDT,
Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I wrote you almost one year ago concerning the proposed Global

Partnership between Sprint Corporation, Deutsche Telekom and France Telecom. At that time, I asked that you rule fairly and promptly on this matter.

It is my understanding the Commission may consider a proposal that appears to have little to do with traditional foreign ownership concerns having to do with the acquisition of undue leverage over domestic companies. Specifically, the FCC would artificially ''freeze'' Sprint's communications capacity between the United States and Germany and France, while placing no such restrictions on any of its major competitors.

Given that the Justice Department has already signed off on the partnership, many believe there is no legitimate foreign investment concern. Even if excessive leverage could be obtained under this partnership, an arbitrary limitation on communications capacity would not alleviate it. In short, it appears the Commission will answer the wrong question with an equally wrong solution. If this were to occur, Sprint would be at a competitive disadvantage with other international competitors.

I look forward to your reply.

Sincerely,

BOB DOLE.

LIMITED PROVISIONS IN THE CONTINUING RESOLUTION

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, one of the most serious defects of the current stopgap funding for the Federal Government is its treatment of LIHEAP, the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program, that helps needy families pay their winter fuel bills. Under that program, States receive most of their full-year LIHEAP allocation in the 2 months of October and November so that they can prepare for the winter, set benefit levels, and deal with emergencies.

It is bad enough that the current stopgap bill cuts these needed funds by 25 percent from last year—25 percent from last year. Even worse, it pays out those funds on a basis that is prorated on a full year, so that the States are receiving far less than the usual share in October and November. By this time last year, Massachusetts had received $32 million of its $54 million allocation. This year, however, Massachusetts has only been allowed to draw down $9.5 million.

In fact, all States had received $800 million of last year's $1.3 billion LIHEAP appropriation by December of last year. Under the stopgap bill, there is a 71-percent cut, although the bill is only supposed to impose a 25 percent cut at most.

This chart demonstrates very clearly what the problem is. First of all, I think everyone across this country understands the extraordinary drops in the temperature in the most recent days. This is playing havoc in many families in Massachusetts, up in Boston, the North Shore, all over Massachusetts and the Berkshires and otherwise. By December 15 of 1994, some $800 million had been distributed. By December 15, 1995, only $230 million under the continuing resolution.

Mr. President, this has to be addressed in the continuing resolution. Unless it is, there will be hundreds of Americans whose very health and risk of freezing will be very, very real. This was a nonintended result of the fact of these continuing resolutions, and it is an emergency. It cries out for action.

We hope that the House of Representatives will take action. Otherwise, I know, under the leadership of Senator WELLSTONE and others, an amendment will be offered to try and reach this emergency situation.

Massachusetts energy agencies have said that they will respond only to cases where a utility terminates services, or where homes have less than one-eighth of a tank of fuel oil. The State has cut annual LIHEAP benefits from $430 to $150 per household to ensure that they have enough funds for emergencies throughout the winter.

In Gloucester, the agencies have been faced with a choice of spending nonauthorized LIHEAP funds or letting some families freeze to death.

In Salem, the local government has dipped into its own scarce funds to provide needed assistance.

In Springfield, Patricia Nelligan, the fuel assistance director for the New England Farm Workers' Council, said that unless more LIHEAP funds are made available soon, their program will have to shut down by the end of next week.

It may not officially be winter yet, but winter has already arrived with a vengeance in many parts of the country. For the 6 million recipients of LIHEAP assistance across the Nation, it will be a desperate Christmas unless more aid is available.

Some 95 percent of the households receiving LIHEAP assistance have annual incomes below $18,000. They spend an extremely burdensome 18 percent of their income on energy, compared to the average middle-class family, which spends only 4 percent.

Researchers at Boston City Hospital have documented the heat or eat effect, where higher utility bills during the coldest months force low-income families to spend less money on food. The result is increased malnutrition among children.

The study also found almost twice as many low-weight and undernourished children were admitted to Boston City Hospital's emergency room immediately following the coldest month of the winter. No family should have to choose between heating and eating.

But it is the poor elderly that will be at the greatest risk if more LIHEAP funds are not made available, because they are the most vulnerable to hypothermia. In fact, older Americans accounted for more than half of all hypothermia deaths in 1991.

In addition, the elderly are much more likely to live in homes built before 1940 which are less energy efficient and put them at greater risk.

Low-income elderly who have trouble paying their fuel bills are often driven to rely on room heaters, fireplaces, ovens, and wood-burning stoves to save money. Between 1986 and 1990, such heating sources were the second leading cause of fire deaths among the elderly. In fact, elderly citizens were up to 12 times more likely to die in heating-related fires than adults under 65.

Over 50 Senators have signed a letter urging the budget negotiators to allow States to draw down LIHEAP funds at the up-front rate if a further stop-gap funding bill is enacted. I urge the Senate to support this provision, so that families can receive the urgent assistance they need.

Christmas is approaching, and in many parts of the country, temperatures have dropped to levels close to those at the North Pole. But Santa Claus does not release LIHEAP funds to the States—Congress does, and we must act quickly to avoid tragedy.

THE DEATH OF THE FORMER CHAPLAIN OF THE SENATE, THE REVEREND DR. RICHARD C. HALVERSON

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, with sadness, tempered by gratitude, I rise today to mourn the passing of the late Chaplain of the Senate, the Rev. Richard C. Halverson. Recently he left this Chamber and this world, but the impression he left is all around us.

Mr. President, we all know that national politics is often wracked by deep disagreement. The task of steering history's most civilized Nation on a wise course through democratic means arouses strong passions. Only spiritual guidance and divine grace could steady this Chamber during the tempests of every age, and we are fortunate to debate in soft tones, and to determine great questions as a civilized community. For the last 14 years, America herself was blessed to have Dr. Halverson, the Senate's Christian humanist, to keep our civilization decent.

Whenever a member of out little civilization lost a loved one—or gained one—the Chaplain's office was a proven source of consolation and hope.

I took the oath here not too long ago, and I remember, among a flood of invitations, one from the good Chaplain asked to come to the weekly Senate prayer breakfast. There are many bipartisan meetings in the Capitol, but the calm communion of Catholics, Jews, and Protestants was tripartisan as well as profoundly contemplative. I treasure those Wednesday morning gatherings as occasions to make deep and abiding friendships with my colleagues.

Mr. President, John Stuart Mill wrote that ''one person with a belief is a social power equal to ninety-nine who have only interests.'' Here in this Chamber, one Chaplain with unshakeable belief was a social power equal to all 100 of us, each with a host of interests and beliefs. He calmed our fears, he kept us together, and every morning he called us to prayer.

Now, as he taught us, I join my colleagues in praying for his soul.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Thomas, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting withdrawals and sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

REPORT OF THE FARMINGTON WILD AND SCENIC RIVER STUDY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 103

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

To the Congress of the United States:

I take pleasure in transmitting the enclosed report for the Farmington River in the States of Massachusetts and Connecticut. The report and my recommendations are in response to the provisions of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, Public Law 90–542, as amended. The Farmington River Study was authorized by Public Law 99–590.

The study was conducted by the National Park Service, with invaluable assistance from a congressionally mandated study committee. The National Park Service determined that the 11-mile study segment in Massachusetts and the 14-mile study segment in Connecticut were eligible for designation based upon their free-flowing character and recreational, fish, wildlife and historic values.

The 14-mile Connecticut segment of the river has already been designated as a Wild and Scenic River pursuant to Public Law 103–313, August 26, 1994. The purpose of this transmittal is to inform the Congress that, although eligible for designation, I do not recommend that the Massachusetts segment be designated at this time due to lack of support by the towns adjoining it. If at some future date the towns should change their position and the river has retained its present characteristics, the Congress could reconsider the issue. Also, for 3 years from the date of this transmittal, the Massachusetts segment will remain subject to section 7(b) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. Section 7(b) prohibits licensing of projects by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission and Federal or federally assisted water resource development projects that would have a direct and adverse effect on the values for which the river might be designated. Finally, the report includes the Upper Farmington River Management Plan that is referenced in Public Law 103–313 as the plan by which the designated river will be managed.

The plan demonstrated a true partnership effort of the type that we believe will be increasingly necessary if we are to have affordable protection of our environment in the future.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 13, 1995.*

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 1:58 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Goetz, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 632. An act to enhance fairness in compensating owners of patents used by the United States.

H.R. 1253. An act to rename the San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge as the Don Edwards San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge.

H.R. 1295. An act to amend the Trademark Act of 1946 to make certain revisions relating to the protection of famous marks.

H.R. 1533. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, to increase the penalty for escaping from a Federal prison.

H.R. 1574. An act to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to exclude certain bank products from the definition of a deposit.

H.R. 1747. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to permanently extend and clarify malpractice coverage for health centers, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2196. An act to amend the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980 with respect to inventions made under cooperative research and development agreements, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2243. An act to amend the Trinity River Basin Fish and Wildlife Management Act of 1984, to extend for three years the availability of moneys for the restoration of fish and wildlife in the Trinity River, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2289. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend permanently certain housing programs, to improve the veterans employment and training system, and to make clarifying and technical amendments to further clarify the employment and reemployment rights and responsibilities of members of the uniformed services, as well as those of the employer community, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2418. An act to improve the capability of analyze deoxyribonucleic acid.

H.R. 2538. An act to make clerical and technical amendments to title 18, United States Code, and other provisions of law relating to crime and criminal justice.

The message also announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 117. Concurrent resolution concerning writer, political philosopher, human rights advocate, and Nobel Peace Prize nominee Wei Jingsheng.

The message further announced that the House agrees to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1240) to combat crime by enhancing the penalties for certain sexual crimes against children.

The message also announced that the House recedes from its amendments to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1868) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, and concurs therein with an amendment.

The message further announced that the Speaker appoints Mr. WISE as a conferee in the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2539) to abolish the Interstate Commerce Commission, to amend subtitle IV of title 49, United States Code, to reform economic regulation of transportation, and for other purposes, vice Mr. LIPINSKI, resigned.

At 4:25 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Goetz, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1977) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and second times by unanimous consent and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1253. An act to rename the San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge as the Don Edwards San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge, to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

H.R. 1533. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, to increase the penalty for escaping from a Federal prison, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1574. An act to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to exclude certain bank products from the definition of a deposit, to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 2196. An act to amend the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980 with respect to inventions made under cooperative research and development agreements, and for other purposes, to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

H.R. 2243. An act to amend the Trinity River Basin Fish and Wildlife Management Act of 1984, to extend for three years the availability of moneys for the restoration of fish and wildlife in the Trinity River, and for other purposes, to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

H.R. 2289. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend permanently certain housing programs, to improve the veterans employment and training system, and to make clarifying and technical amendments to further clarify the employment and reemployment rights and responsibilities of members of the uniformed services, as well as those of the employer community, and for other purposes, to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 2418. An act to improve the capability to analyze deoxyribonucleic acid; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2538. An act to make clerical and technical amendments to title 18, United States Code, and other provisions of law relating to crime and criminal justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The following concurrent resolution was read, and referred as indicated:

H. Con. Res. 117. Concurrent resolution concerning writer, political philosopher, human rights advocate, and Nobel Peace Prize nominee Wei Jingsheng, to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, which were referred as indicated:

EC–1681. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, the report of the texts of international agreements, other than treaties, and background statements; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1682. A communication from the Administrator of the Federal Highway Administration, the Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report entitled, ''Progress Made in Implementing Sections 6106 and 1038 of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (ISTEA)''; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1683. A communication from the Administrator the Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report entitled, ''The Superfund Innovative Technology Evaluation Program'' for fiscal year 1994; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1684. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report on child support enforcement for fiscal year 1994; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–1685. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the first annual report summarizing the evaluation activities relative to the Comprehensive Community Mental Health Services with Serious Emotional Disturbances program; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC–1686. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of State (Legislative Affairs), transmitting, a draft of proposed legislation to make technical revisions to existing immigration law and to promote the efficiency and effectiveness of consular and immigration services and operations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–1687. A communication from the Secretary of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1994; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–1688. A communication from the Chairman of the Federal Election Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, proposed regulations governing corporation and labor organization activity, express advocacy and coordination with candidates; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

EC–1689. A communication from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report under the Inspector General Act for the period April 1 through September 30, 1995; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–1690. A communication from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report under the Inspector General Act for the period April 1 through September 30, 1995; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–1691. A communication from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report under the Inspector General Act for the period April 1 through September 30, 1995; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–1692. A communication from the Secretary of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report under the Inspector General Act for the period April 1 through September 30, 1995; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–1693. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report under the Inspector General Act for the period April 1 through September 30, 1995; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–1694. A communication from the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, the Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on accounts containing unvouchered expenditures potentially subject to audit by the Comptroller General; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–1695. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report under the Inspector General Act for the period April 1 through September 30, 1995; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–1696. A communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report under the Inspector General Act for the period April 1 through September 30, 1995; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–1697. A communication from the Chairman of the Board of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report under the Inspector General Act for the period April 1 through September 30, 1995; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM–480. A resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

''RESOLUTION

''Whereas the federal government is considering legislation that would repeal the existing authority of the Interstate Commerce Commission to regulate water carriers transporting property between the 48 contiguous states and Alaska; and

''Whereas Alaska is uniquely dependent on water transportation in that virtually everything that Alaskans eat, drink, wear, or use comes into the state by ship or barge; and

''Whereas the deep water transport market serving the Alaska Railbelt is a classic duopoly situation in that two water carriers provide the vital service of transporting at least 75 percent of all goods shipped for 80 percent of the state's residents; and

''Whereas, in a duopoly situation, the service providers have an obligation to their customers to operate with the highest degree of fairness and disclosure; and

''Whereas the freight system by which Alaskans receive vital cargo should treat all customers fairly by guaranteeing equal access to competitive rates; and

''Whereas the citizens of Alaska, recognizing that their interests may best be served by allowing market forces to determine the cost of bringing vital goods to the state so far as possible, continue to have concerns about the cost of shipping goods to Alaska; and

''Whereas the citizens of Alaska have also expressed their desire to preserve the essential elements of the current system of regulating water carriers serving Alaska; and

''Whereas, if the Interstate Commerce Commission is abolished and if there is no other forum for shipper complaints, the citizens of the state may have no place to present and resolve complaints about water carriers serving Alaska other than in court; and

''Whereas the federal government has historically had a role in water transportation to Alaska through the Interstate Commerce Commission; and

''Whereas the federal government is considering whether to transfer some functions of the Interstate Commerce Commission to the United States Department of Transportation; and

''Whereas the Interstate Commerce Commission has recommended that the regulation of all domestic offshore water carriage be handled by the Federal Maritime Commission, which may also be abolished; and

''Whereas regulatory functions of the Interstate Commerce Commission relating to domestic offshore water carriage could be performed by other existing federal entities if the Interstate Commerce Commission is abolished in order to save federal taxpayer money; and

''Whereas three primary interests of Alaskans if such abolishment occurs are to ensure that rates for carriage to Alaska are fair and competitive, to ensure that carriage service to Alaska is dependable, and to ensure that an accessible forum exists in which Alaskans can present and resolve complaints; be it

''*Resolved*, That the Alaska State Legislature respectfully requests that the Governor and members of the Alaska delegation in the United States Congress support the preservation of the essential regulatory functions of the Interstate Commerce Commission pertaining to domestic offshore water carriage that serve the best interests of Alaska's consumers while providing an acceptable rate of return to the carriers which serve the Alaska market by transferring such regulatory functions to the United States Department of Transportation, if and when necessary.''

POM–481. A resolution adopted by the Commission of the City of Boynton, Floria relative to the Superfund Reform 95 principles; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

POM–482. A resolution adopted by the House of the Legislature of the State of Georgia; to the Committee on Finance.

''Whereas, the members of state legislatures are required to be away from their homes while performing the duties of their offices; and

''Whereas, members of state legislatures are reimbursed for their travel expenses and the other expenses incurred in performing their duties; and

''Whereas, under the provisions of 26 U.S.C., Section 162(h), state legislators are allowed to deduct such reasonable travel expenses for purposes of income taxation; and

''Whereas, the payment of such expenses is currently subject to withholding for purposes of the federal Social Security Act and for purposes of federal income taxation; and

''Whereas, it is only fitting and proper that such expenses should not be subjected to withholding for these purposes: Now, therefore, be it

''*Resolved by the House of Representatives*, That this body urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation which would exclude the travel expenses and per diem of state legislators from income for purposes of contributions required under the federal Social Security Act and from withholding for purposes of federal income taxation, BE IT FURTHER

''*Resolved* That the Clerk of the House of Representatives is authorized and directed to transmit appropriate copies of this resolution to the Congress of the United States and to each member of Congress from the State of Georgia.''

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following report of committee was submitted:

By Mr. HATFIELD, from the Committee on Appropriations:

Special Report entitled ''Revised Allocation to Subcommittees of Budget Totals from the Concurrent Resolution for Fiscal Year 1996'' (Rept. No. 104–184).

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF COMMITTEES

The following executive report of committees was submitted:

By Mr. STEVENS, from the Committee on Governmental Affairs:

Donald S. Wasserman, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the Federal Labor Relations Authority for a term of five years expiring July 1, 2000.

(The above nomination was reported with the recommendation that he be confirmed, subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. BREAUX (for himself and Mr. JOHNSTON):

S. 1472. A bill to provide for one additional Federal judge for the middle district of Louisiana and one less Federal judge for the eastern district of Louisiana; read the first time.

By Ms. SNOWE (for herself and Mr. MACK):

S. 1473. A bill to authorize the Administrator of General Services to permit the posting in space under the control of the Administrator of notices concerning missing children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 1474. A bill to provide new authority for probation and pretrial services officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEVENS (for himself and Mr. MURKOWSKI):

S. 1475. A bill to provide an antitrust exemption for persons engaged in the fishing industry and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KERRY (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 1476. A bill to establish the Boston Harbor Islands National Recreation Area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mrs. KASSEBAUM:

S. 1477. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and the Public Health Service Act to improve the regulation of food, drugs, devices, and biological products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

By Mr. DOLE (for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. EXON):

S.J. Res. 44. A joint resolution concerning the deployment of U.S. Armed Forces in Bosnia-Herzegovina; considered and passed.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mrs. HUTCHISON (for herself, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. KYL, Mr. LOTT, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BURNS, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. COATS, Mr. D'AMATO, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. FAIRCLOTH, Mr. FRIST, Mr. GRAMS, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HELMS, Mr. KEMPTHORNE, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. PRESSLER, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. SMITH, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. THOMPSON, and Mr. THURMOND):

S. Con. Res. 35. A concurrent resolution expressing the opposition of the Congress to President Clinton's planned deployment of United States ground forces to Bosnia; submitted and read.

By Mr. LEVIN:

S. Con. Res. 36. A concurrent resolution directing the Secretary of the Senate to make technical corrections in the enrollment of S. 1060; considered and agreed to.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Ms. SNOWE (for herself and Mr. Mack):

S. 1473. A bill to authorize the Administrator of General Services to permit the posting in space under the control of the Administrator of notices concerning missing children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

MISSING CHILDREN LEGISLATION

● Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I introduce a small but important piece of legislation designed to assist parents in times of terrible crisis and need, times that every parent has nightmares about—when their children are missing.

Imagine the horror of discovering that your child is missing. Imagine the pain and emotion that overcomes a family at such a time. Imagine the strength and dedication that such families muster in order to do everything possible to locate that child. And imagine how this horror and devastation becomes compounded by senseless Government regulations which hinder their efforts to locate their children.

Consider the tragic experience of Claudine and Don Ryce, the parents of Jimmy Ryce, a 10-year-old Florida boy who disappeared on September 11 of this year. Jimmy disappeared somewhere in the three square blocks between his school bus stop and his home.

Tragically, Jimmy's body was found late last week. I extend my deepest sympathy, and my most sincere condolences, to his family.

I want Jimmy's parents to know that I heard about the frustration they encountered as they searched for their son. I want them to know that Congress will do something to rectify this. Today, I want to break down one barrier that they encountered in their vigilant efforts to locate their son.

Jimmy's parents tell the story of how simple tasks, such as posting notices in Federal buildings with Jimmy's picture on it, were frustrated by senseless Government regulation. They tell of how, with the assistance of the FBI, they would post these notices in one Federal agency building, only to have them removed by employees of another agency. Imagine how frustrating this must be to parents of missing children. How frustrating this must be, especially since photographs of missing children are the most effective tool we have for locating these children.

Unfortunately, far too many children are missing in this country. A 1990 study by the Department of Justice—the most recent study on this issue—found that in 1988 there were as many as:

114,600 attempted abductions of children by non-family members;

4,600 abductions by non-family members reported to the police;

300 abductions by non-family members where the children were gone for long periods of time or were murdered;

354,000 children abducted by family members;

450,700 children who ran away; and

438,200 children who were lost, injured or otherwise missing.

Moreover, the National Crime Information Center reports that approximately 60,000 children are missing at any given time.

The legislation that I introduce today is designed to help the parents of these missing children by eliminating one barrier that Jimmy's parents faced in their search for their son.

This legislation amends the Protection of Public Property Act, which empowers the General Services Administration [GSA] to set rules governing Federal property under its control. Currently, Federal regulations issued by the GSA prohibit the posting of materials on Federal property. My bill directs the GSA to make a very important exception to these rules, and requires the GSA to draft regulations allowing the posting of notices designed to locate missing children. It also ensures that Federal employees cannot needlessly remove these posters.

As Jimmy's father said, ''There are things the Government can do, simple things, that would make it easier to publicize'' that a child is missing. He also said that we need to ''turn these agencies into our allies.''

Well, Mr. Ryce, you are correct, and I believe that this legislation will do just that.●

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 1474. A bill to provide new authority for probation and pretrial services officers, and for other purposes.

PROBATION AND PRETRIAL SERVICES OFFICERS LEGISLATION

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, today I introduce a bill that would grant Federal probation and pretrial services officers authority to carry firearms, when approved by the appropriate district court, under rules prescribed by the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts.

To add that new authority, the bill amends 18 U.S.C. 3603, which sets out the duties of probation officers, and 18 U.S.C. 3154, which establishes the functions of pretrial services officers. The change will permit those officers to carry firearms as they perform their important and frequently dangerous duties.

State law currently governs whether Federal probation and pretrial services officers may carry weapons; that law is inconsistent from State to State. Research by the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts shows that only three States give specific authority to Federal probation and pretrial services officers to carry weapons. Forty-four States authorize Federal probation officers to carry firearms based either on statutory authority given to State probation officers or peace officers, or on State attorney general opinions. Although some of those States similarly authorize Federal pretrial services officers to carry firearms, at least 14 of them have neglected to extend that authority to those officers.

More important, certain States prohibit Federal probation and pretrial services from carrying weapons even where the officer has court approval to do so. Officers in those jurisdictions are left vulnerable to serious harm or death. A 1993 study undertaken by the Federal Probation and Pretrial Officers Association revealed that, in the Federal and local systems, 1,818 serious assaults and 792 attempted assaults against probation and pretrial services officers occurred between 1980 and 1992. The study acknowledges that those numbers probably understate the actual figures since some jurisdictions did not respond the association's study.

In my view, the risks faced by Federal probation and pretrial services officers cannot be overemphasized. These officers risk their safety and their lives every day, often supervising violent offenders in situations that place them and others at risk of bodily harm. We should ensure that, wherever those officers are, they are authorized to carry a firearm.

Not only does this bill address problems faced by officers who work out of jurisdictions in which they are not permitted to carry a firearm, but it addresses difficulties faced by officers who must cross State lines in the performance of their duties. Under current law, even officers who are authorized under one State's laws to carry weapons may still run afoul of another State's laws when they cross State lines. Without a Federal statute authorizing officers to carry firearms, they may be acting illegally when they cross State lines to perform their duties. Many Federal officers supervise offenders near a State border and must travel interstate to carry out their duties. An offender may have a nearby job in an adjacent State, for example, and the officer may need to travel to the job site to verify the offender's employment.

Problems may also arise for officers who live in one State and work in another. For instance, officers who live in Wisconsin and work in Minnesota are not allowed to obtain a gun permit from Minnesota. Similar situations arise in other States. Officers may be unable to obtain licenses from the State in which they reside even though they may work in a neighboring State that permits some of it residents to carry firearms.

These officers work in inherently dangerous environments. The Federal Probation and Pretrail Officers Association wrote to me on September 15, 1995:

> Under enhanced supervision practices, we supervise in the field, in the most crime-infested areas of urban environments as well as in the most remote rural areas of urban environments as well as in the most remote rural areas. [I]f enacted, [the bill] would give all officers a significant measure of support and protection which they certainly deserve.

I wholeheartedly agree.

This bill will correct the current intolerable situation. The security of Federal probation and pretrial services officers should not be left to the vagaries of State law.

Of course, these Federal officers will be fully trained and closely supervised in their use of firearms. Under the bill, probation and pretrial services officers will be permitted to carry firearms only pursuant to regulations promulgated by the Director of the Administrative Office of the U.S. courts. The Administrative Office has informed me that these regulations would include extensive training and safety requirements, and that most of them are already in effect for those officers authorized to carry firearms.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1474

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. NEW AUTHORITY FOR PROBATION AND PRETRIAL SERVICES OFFICERS.

(a) PROBATION OFFICERS.—Section 3603 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (8)(B);

(2) by redesignating paragraph (9) as paragraph (10); and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (8) the following new paragraph:

''(9) if approved by the district court, be authorized to carry firearms under such rules and regulations as the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts may prescribe; and''.

(b) PRETRAIL SERVICES OFFICERS.—Section 3154 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (13) as paragraph (14); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (12) the following new paragraph:

''(13) As approved by the district court, carry firearms under such rules and regulations as the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts may prescribe.''.

By Mr. STEVENS (for himself and Mr. MURKOWSKI):

S. 1475. A bill to provide an antitrust exemption for persons engaged in the fishing industry and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

THE FISHING INDUSTRY BARGAINING ACT

● Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, today I am introducing the Fishing Industry Bargaining Act, a bill to provide antitrust immunity to fishermen and fish processors which would allow them to collectively agree on the prices paid to fishermen and on the minimum price fish processors will accept for the sale of processed fish products.

Senator MURKOWSKI joins me as a cosponsor of this legislation.

We are introducing the bill because the Alaska State Legislature enacted a State law to confer identical antitrust immunity on Alaska fishermen and processors.

The changes to Alaska law will only have effect if the changes we are proposing to Federal law are enacted.

Our bill would add a new section to the act approved on June 25, 1934, which authorizes producers of aquatic products to form associations, to allow fishermen and fish processors to collectively agree on prices.

The bill would prevent fish processors from agreeing on prices unless fishermen participated in the agreement and are party to the agreement.

This antitrust exemption would apply to fishermen and fish processors in all parts of the country, not just in Alaska.

We look forward to hearing from the Alaska fishing industry and from the fishing industry in other parts of the country about the legislation.

If there is support, we would hope to enact the bill sometime next year.

I ask for unimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1475

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Fishing Industry Bargaining Act''.

(b) AMENDMENT TO ACT OF 1934.—The Act approved June 25, 1934, authorizing associations of producers of aquatic products (15 U.S.C. 1521 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 2 the following new section:

''SEC. 3. Persons engaged in the fishing industry as fishermen, including fishermen acting through associations allowed under section 1, may collectively agree with fish processors, including fish processors acting through associations of processors, on (1) the

price paid to the fishermen for aquatic products, and (2) the minimum price that fish processors will accept for the sale of processed aquatic products. Nothing in this section shall be construed to allow fish processors to agree among themselves on the price paid to fishermen or the minimum price that fish processors will accept for the sale of processed aquatic products if fishermen did not participate in the making of the agreement and are not a party to the agreement.●

By Mr. KERRY (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 1476. A bill to establish the Boston Harbor Islands National Recreation Area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

BOSTON HARBOR ISLANDS NATIONAL RECREATION AREA LEGISLATION

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, today, I am pleased to join with Senator KENNEDY in introducing legislation to establish the Boston Harbor Islands National Recreation Area. Our bill is the companion legislation to H.R. 2763, introduced yesterday by Congressman GERRY STUDDS and PETER TORKILDSEN. I especially want to acknowledge the enormous leadership efforts of Congressman STUDDS in preparing this initiative and I look forward to working with him and others in the months ahead to enact this legislation.

Thirty-one islands sprinkled throughout Boston Harbor and the surrounding waterway would comprise the national recreational area. Our legislation is based upon a special resource study completed by the National Park Service in 1994 which found that the Boston Harbor Islands and surrounding area meet the Service's criteria for inclusion in the National Park System. However, trying to balance the need for fiscal restraint with the importance of protecting our national heritage, our bill is a much-scaled-down version of the one envisioned in the study. Our bill would fully utilize a unique partnership among the Federal, State, and local governments and the private sector and would require that at least 75 percent of the operational expenses for the park will come from non-Federal funding.

Boston has a rich and diverse history and has been and remains the economic and cultural center of New England. Today, Boston is nationally and internationally renowned in fields such as higher education, health care, technology, transportation, and trade. Beginning centuries ago, Boston Harbor has played a significant role in shaping the city's and the region's direction and growth, and the harbor area contains some of the oldest and most significant historic sites in the Nation, dating from precolonial times.

The islands themselves are rich in historical diversity, containing numerous military and maritime sites. In addition, there are important archaeological sites which chronicle the use and settlement of the harbor by native Americans from at least 9,000 years ago through the 17th century. With its proximity to the city, the park would provide an excellent opportunity to thousands of people to enjoy its outstanding natural, historic, scenic, recreational, and educational values.

As a National Recreation Area, the Boston Harbor Island and surrounding area would enhance the National Park System by promoting this nationally significant history while providing leisure attractions to the public. The park is projected to attract to the area an additional 500,000 visitors annually, create 700 new jobs, and bring an additional $200 million into the region's economy.

In 1970, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts began to acquire the islands of Boston Harbor for the benefit of the public. Since that time, a significant effort has been made to clean up the waters of Boston Bay to again make it attractive to boating, fishing, and other recreational and commercial activities. During the 1980's, the citizens of the Greater Boston area have undertaken what may prove to be the largest water infrastructure project in North America which is intended to guarantee that the Boston Bay's ecological health will be good for the foreseeable future.

The bill we are introducing would establish the Boston Harbor Islands partnership to coordinate the activities of Federal, State, and local authorities and the private sector in developing and implementing an integrated management plan for the islands. In addition, an advisory council would be established to provide representation for interested groups and organizations. This council would make recommendations to the partnership on issues including tourism, transportation, natural resources, cultural and historic resources, and fundraising.

Finally, our legislation would require a ratio of at least three non-Federal dollars for every Federal dollar spent on the park. Using limited Federal resources to leverage a significant local effort is a concept that merits support. By creating a national recreation area, we will preserve an important piece of our American heritage, give it the prominence and honor it richly deserves, accomplish all this with the Federal Government covering only a fraction of its cost, and facilitate the efforts of the Boston area to preserve its history and enhance recreational opportunities for its citizens and visitors.

I am sure Senator KENNEDY and I will be joined by the Massachusetts delegation and others as we work for passage of this important legislation. I am hopeful that the Congress will look favorably upon this initiative which would bring an important, historically significant addition to our National Park System without imposing great new financial burdens on it.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1476

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. FINDINGS AND PURPOSES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) Boston is the economic and cultural center of New England and a city of national and international significance;

(2) the Boston metropolitan region plays a leadership role in the areas of higher education, technology, health care, transportation, and national and international trade;

(3) Boston and the immediate region contain some of the oldest, most valuable, and most visited historic sites in the Nation, dating from precolonial times;

(4) factors such as open space, parks, recreational opportunities, and natural and cultural resource preservation will help determine the region's success and long-term economic and social viability into the 21st century;

(5) Boston Harbor has been a major factor in shaping Boston's growth, development, and sustained influence and significance in New England and the Nation;

(6) years of neglect and overuse of Boston Harbor resulted in a serious decline in its water quality, but a major cleanup effort is fostering the Harbor's renewal and revitalization, making the Harbor once again a focal point for the city and region;

(7) the Boston Harbor Islands support invaluable natural resources, rare in urban settings, that include fresh and salt water marshes, dunes, woodlands, ledges and cliffs, and habitat for wildlife and numerous bird species;

(8) Boston Harbor and its islands, containing many fortifications and other sites related to coastal defense, played an important role in United States military and maritime history from the colonial era to the Cold War;

(9) Boston Harbor and its islands contain important archaeological sites and underwater archaeological resources that chronicle the use and settlement of the Harbor by Native Americans from at least 9,000 years ago until the 17th century;

(10) the Boston Harbor Islands offer abundant opportunities for public education on the attempts of society to deal with urban problems and to protect the ecological health of the Harbor;

(11) the Boston Harbor Islands offer opportunities for recreation, education, and public use and enjoyment in a maritime setting that is in close proximity to a large urban population;

(12) the Boston Harbor Islands are located in a mixed use area, including an active commercial seaport and the region's busiest airport, the present and future operation of which are essential for the economic stability of the region;

(13) the Boston Harbor Islands possess outstanding natural, historical, scenic, recreational, and educational values, and there is a national interest in protecting and preserving those values for residents and visitors of the area; and

(14) a partnership among Federal, State, and local governments and nonprofit organizations offers the best opportunity for the enhancement and management of the Boston Harbor Islands.

(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this Act are—

(1) to preserve for public use and enjoyment the lands and waters that comprise the Boston Harbor Islands National Recreation Area;

(2) to manage the recreation area in partnership with the private sector, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, municipalities surrounding Massachusetts Bay and Cape Cod Bay, the Thompson Island Outward Bound Education Center, and The Trustees of Reservations and with historical, business, cultural, civic, recreational, and tourism organizations; and

(3) to improve access to the Boston Harbor Islands through the use of public water transportation.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) ADVISORY COUNCIL.—The term ''advisory council'' means the Boston Harbor Islands Advisory Council established under section 8.

(2) MANAGEMENT PLAN.—The term ''management plan'' means the management plan for the recreation area approved under section 7.

(3) PARTNERSHIP.—The term ''Partnership'' means the Boston Harbor Islands Partnership established by section 5.

(4) RECREATION AREA.—The term ''recreation area'' means the Boston Harbor Islands National Recreation Area established by section 3.

(5) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 3. BOSTON HARBOR ISLANDS NATIONAL RECREATION AREA.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—In order to preserve for the benefit and inspiration of the people of the United States as a national recreation area certain lands located in Massachusetts Bay, there is established as a unit of the National Park System the Boston Harbor Islands National Recreation Area.

(b) BOUNDARIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The recreation area shall—

(A) be comprised of the lands, waters, and submerged lands generally depicted on the map entitled ''Proposed Boston Harbor Islands NRA'', numbered BOHA 80001, and dated August 1995; and

(B) include landside points required for access, visitor services, and administration—

(i) in the city of Boston along the Harborwalk and at Long Wharf, Castle Island, Fan Pier, the John F. Kennedy Library, and the Custom House;

(ii) at Charlestown Navy Yard;

(iii) at the old Northern Avenue Bridge;

(iv) in the city of Quincy at Squantum Point/Marina Bay, the Fore River Shipyard, and Town River;

(v) in the town of Hingham at Hewitt's Cove;

(vi) in the town of Hull;

(vii) in the city of Salem at Salem National Historic Site; and

(viii) in the city of Lynn at Heritage State Park.

(2) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF MAP.—The map described in paragraph (1) shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the National Park Service.

(3) MINOR REVISIONS.—After advising the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate in writing, the Secretary may make minor revisions to the boundaries of the recreation area by publication of a revised drawing or other boundary description in the Federal Register.

SEC. 4. ADMINISTRATION OF RECREATION AREA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The recreation area shall be administered by the Secretary in accordance with this Act.

(b) FEDERAL LAND.—The land in the recreation area that is owned by the United States, acting through the Secretary, shall be administered in accordance with the law generally applicable to units of the National Park System, including the Act entitled ''An Act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes'', approved August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535, chapter 408; 16 U.S.C. 1 et seq.), and the Act of August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 666, chapter 593; 16 U.S.C. 461 et seq.).

(c) STATE AND LOCAL JURISDICTION.—Nothing in this Act diminishes, enlarges, or modifies any right of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts or any political subdivision of the Commonwealth to exercise civil and criminal jurisdiction or to carry out State laws in the recreation area, including laws relating to fish and wildlife and laws relating to the taxation of persons or property in the recreation area.

(d) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—The Secretary may consult and enter into cooperative agreements with such persons or entities as the Secretary determines to be appropriate for the preservation, interpretation, management, and provision of educational and recreational uses for the properties in the recreation area.

(e) ACQUISITION OF REAL AND PERSONAL PROPERTY AND SERVICES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may acquire for purposes of the recreation area, by donation, exchange, or lease or purchase with donated or appropriated funds, personal property and lands and improvements in the recreation area.

(2) LIMITATION.—The Secretary may not acquire an interest in real property in the recreation area without the consent of the owner.

(f) OTHER PROPERTY, FUNDS, AND SERVICES.—The Secretary may accept and use donated funds, property, and services to carry out this Act.

(g) RELATIONSHIP OF RECREATION AREA TO BOSTON-LOGAN INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT.—With respect to the recreation area, the maintenance, operation, improvement, and use of Logan International Airport and associated flight patterns from time to time in effect shall not be considered to constitute the use of publicly owned land of a public park, recreation area, or other resource within the meaning of section 303(c) of title 49, United States Code, or to have a significant effect on natural, scenic, and recreation assets within the meaning of section 47101(h)(2) of title 49, United States Code.

SEC. 5. BOSTON HARBOR ISLANDS PARTNERSHIP.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the executive branch the Boston Harbor Islands Partnership, the purpose of which shall be to coordinate the activities of Federal, State, and local authorities and the private sector in the development and implementation of an integrated resource management plan for the recreation area.

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—The Partnership shall be composed of 13 members, including—

(1) 1 individual appointed by the Secretary to represent the National Park Service;

(2) 1 individual appointed by the Secretary of Transportation to represent the United States Coast Guard;

(3) 2 individuals appointed by the Secretary, after consideration of recommendations by the Governor of Massachusetts, to represent the Department of Environmental Management and the Metropolitan District Commission;

(4) 1 individual appointed by the Secretary, after consideration of recommendations by the chairperson of the Massachusetts Port Authority, to represent the Massachusetts Port Authority;

(5) 1 individual appointed by the Secretary, after consideration of recommendations by the chairperson of the Massachusetts Water Resources Authority, to represent the Massachusetts Water Resources Authority;

(6) 1 individual appointed by the Secretary, after consideration of recommendations by the mayor of Boston, to represent the Office of Environmental Services of the city of Boston;

(7) 1 individual appointed by the Secretary, after consideration of recommendations by the chairperson of the Boston Redevelopment Authority, to represent the Boston Redevelopment Authority;

(8) 1 individual appointed by the Secretary, after consideration of recommendations by the president of the Thompson Island Outward Bound Education Center, to represent the Center Thompson Island Outward Bound Education;

(9) 1 individual appointed by the Secretary, after consideration of recommendations by the chairperson of The Trustees of Reservations, to represent The Trustees of Reservations;

(10) 1 individual appointed by the Secretary, after consideration of recommendations of the president of the Island Alliance, to represent the Island Alliance, a nonprofit organization the sole purpose of which is to provide financial support for the recreation area; and

(11) 2 individuals appointed by the Secretary to represent the advisory council.

(c) TERMS OF OFFICE; REAPPOINTMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each member of the Partnership shall appointed for a term of 3 years.

(2) REAPPOINTMENT.—Any member may be reappointed for 1 additional 3-year term.

(3) INITIAL MEMBERS.—The Secretary shall appoint the first members of the Partnership not later than 30 days after the date on which the Secretary has received all of the recommendations for appointment under paragraphs (3) through (10) of subsection (b).

(4) EXTENDED SERVICE.—A member of the Partnership may serve after the expiration of the member's term until a successor has been appointed.

(d) COMPENSATION.—A member of the Partnership shall serve without pay, but while away from the member's home or regular place of business in the performance of services for the Partnership, a member shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in the same manner as a person employed intermittently in the Government service is allowed expenses under section 5703 of title 5, United States Code.

(e) ELECTION OF OFFICERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Partnership shall elect 1 of its members as Chairperson and 1 as Vice Chairperson.

(2) TERMS.—The term of office of the Chairperson and Vice Chairperson shall each be 1 year.

(3) ABSENCE OF CHAIRPERSON.—The Vice Chairperson shall serve as chairperson in the absence of the Chairperson.

(f) VACANCY.—A vacancy in the Partnership shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(g) MEETINGS.—The Partnership shall meet at the call of the Chairperson or a majority of its members.

(h) QUORUM.—A majority of the Partnership shall constitute a quorum.

(i) STAFFING.—

(1) PROVISION BY THE SECRETARY.—The Secretary shall provide the Partnership with such staff and technical assistance as the Secretary, after consultation with the Partnership, considers appropriate to enable the Partnership to carry out its duties.

(2) PERSONNEL ON DETAIL.—To assist the Partnership, the Secretary may accept the services of personnel detailed from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, a political subdivision of the Commonwealth, or an entity represented in the Partnership.

(j) NATURE OF PARTNERSHIP.—The members of the Partnership and the entities represented in the Partnership shall not be treated as partners in a legal sense.

SEC. 6. POWERS OF THE PARTNERSHIP.

(a) HEARINGS.—The Partnership may hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, and receive such evidence as the Partnership considers appropriate.

(b) DONATIONS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Partnership may seek and accept donations of funds, property, or services from individuals, foundations, corporations, and other private and public entities for the purpose of carrying out this Act.

(c) USE OF FUNDS TO OBTAIN MONEY.—The Partnership may use its funds to obtain money from any source under any program or law requiring the recipient of the money to make a contribution in order to receive the money.

(d) MAILS.—The Partnership may use the United States mails in the same manner and on the same conditions as other departments and agencies of the United States.

(e) ACQUISITION OF PROPERTY.—The Partnership may acquire by purchase, rental, donation, or otherwise, such property, facilities, and services as may be needed to carry out its duties, except that the Partnership may not acquire any real property or interest in real property.

(f) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—For purposes of carrying out the management plan, the Partnership may enter into cooperative agreements with the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, a political subdivision of the Commonwealth, or a private person or organization.

SEC. 7. INTEGRATED RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Partnership shall develop and submit to the Secretary a management plan for the recreation area to be implemented by the Partnership.

(b) CONTENTS.—The management plan shall include—

(1) a program providing for coordinated administration of the recreation area with proposed assignment of responsibilities to the appropriate governmental unit at the Federal, State, and local levels, and nonprofit organizations, including—

(A) a program to finance and support the public improvements and services recommended in the plan, including allocation of the non-Federal matching requirement in accordance with section 9 and a delineation of private sector roles and responsibilities; and

(B) a program for the coordination and consolidation, to the extent feasible, of activities that may be carried out by Federal, State, and local agencies having jurisdiction over lands and waters in the recreation area, including planning and regulatory responsibilities;

(2) policies and programs for—

(A) enhancing public outdoor recreational opportunities in the recreation area;

(B) conserving, protecting, and maintaining the scenic, historical, cultural, natural, and scientific values of the recreation area;

(C) developing educational opportunities in the recreation area;

(D) enhancing public access to the Boston Harbor Islands, including development of transportation networks; and

(E) identifying potential sources of revenue from programs or activities carried out within the recreation area; and

(3) a policy statement that recognizes economic activities in the recreation area being conducted on the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) DEVELOPMENT.—In developing the management plan, the Partnership shall—

(1) consult on a regular basis with appropriate officials of any local government or Federal or State agency that has jurisdiction over lands and waters in the recreation area;

(2) consult with interested conservation, business, professional, and citizen organizations; and

(3) conduct public hearings or meetings for the purposes of providing interested persons with the opportunity to testify with respect to matters to be addressed by the management plan.

(d) APPROVAL.—

(1) SUBMISSION TO GOVERNOR.—The Partnership shall submit the management plan to the Governor of Massachusetts for review.

(2) CONSIDERATION BY GOVERNOR.—The Governor shall have 90 days in which to review and make recommendations regarding the management plan.

(3) SUBMISSION TO THE SECRETARY.—After considering the Governor's recommendations, the Partnership shall submit the management plan to the Secretary, who shall approve or disapprove the plan not later than 90 days after submission.

(4) CONSIDERATIONS.—In reviewing the management plan, the Secretary shall consider—

(A) the adequacy of public participation;

(B) assurances of plan implementation from State and local officials; and

(C) the adequacy of regulatory and financial tools that are in place to implement the plan.

(5) DISAPPROVAL.—

(A) NOTICE.—If the Secretary disapproves the management plan, the Secretary shall notify the Partnership in writing of the reasons for the disapproval and make recommendations for revision.

(B) RESUBMISSION.—Not later than 90 days after receipt of a notice of disapproval, the Partnership shall revise and resubmit the management plan to the Secretary, who shall approve or disapprove the revised management plan within 60 days after submission.

(e) INTERIM PROGRAM.—Prior to approval of the management plan, the Secretary and the Partnership shall assist the owners and managers of lands and waters in the recreation area to ensure that existing programs, services, and activities that promote the purposes of this Act are supported.

SEC. 8. BOSTON HARBOR ISLANDS ADVISORY COUNCIL.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary, acting through the Director of the National Park Service, shall establish an advisory committee to be known as the ''Boston Harbor Islands Advisory Council''.

(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of the advisory council shall be—

(1) to represent various groups with interests in the recreation area; and

(2) to make recommendations to the Partnership on issues related to the development and implementation of the management plan.

(c) MEMBERSHIP.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The advisory council shall consist of not fewer than 15 individuals, to be appointed by the Secretary, acting through the Director of the National Park Service.

(2) REPRESENTATION.—The Secretary shall appoint no fewer than 3 individuals to represent each of the following categories of entities:

(A) Municipalities.

(B) Educational and cultural institutions.

(C) Environmental organizations.

(D) Business and commercial entities, including those related to transportation, tourism, and the maritime industry.

(E) Boston Harbor-related advocacy organizations.

(d) COMMITTEES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The advisory council shall be encouraged to establish committees relating to specific recreation area management issues, including education, tourism, transportation, natural resources, cultural and historical resources, and revenue raising.

(2) PARTICIPATION.—Participation on a committee under paragraph (1) shall not be limited to members of the advisory council.

(e) MEETINGS.—Meetings of the advisory council and committees established by the advisory council shall be open to the public.

(f) FACA.—Section 14 of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) shall not apply to the advisory council.

SEC. 9. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out this Act.

(b) MATCHING REQUIREMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Amounts appropriated to carry out this Act for any fiscal year may be expended only on a matching basis in a ratio of at least 3 non-Federal dollars to each Federal dollar.

(2) FORM.—The non-Federal share of the match may be in the form of cash, services, or in-kind contributions, fairly valued.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, it is a privilege to join Senator KERRY today in sponsoring a bill to establish the Boston Harbor Islands National Recreation Area in Massachusetts. This legislation is part of a bipartisan effort with Congressmen GERRY STUDDS and PETER TORKILDSEN, who introduced an identical bill yesterday in the House of Representatives.

The legislation follows a comprehensive study by the National Park Service, authorized in 1992 and completed last year. That study reached the strong conclusion on the 31 islands clustered in Boston Harbor that ''[t]heir proximity to a large urban population and their special geological, prehistoric, historic, and natural features qualify them collectively as an outstanding example of a nationally significant recreation area. Their configuration, their assemblage of significant natural and cultural features, and their proximity to a major metropolitan area create a resource that has no parallel in the United States.''

The islands are just a short boat trip from downtown Boston. They offer abundant opportunities for visitors to enjoy surroundings of exceptional natural beauty. With rocky shores, sand beaches, and tidal pools full of marine life from horseshoe crabs to starfish and seals, visitors enjoy swimming, fishing, clam-digging, berry-picking, bird and whale watching, boating, camping and hiking on well-maintained trails. History lovers can explore national historic landmarks, such as the Revolutionary War-era fort that later housed Confederate prisoners in the Civil War, and the Nation's first lighthouse—the only lighthouse still operated by lighthouse keepers in the old tradition. They can hunt for pirate relics, and dig further back in time for archaeological artifacts from 10,000 years ago and rare geological formations dating to the glacial age. All of the islands offer spectacular views of the modern Boston skyline and the Atlantic Ocean.

But these assets have gone largely unnoticed until recently. The Park

Service study has helped catalyze a growing recognition that the Harbor Islands deserve protection, as a unique resource that can greatly expand recreational opportunities for families in the Boston area and for visitors from across the country. Already, more than 25 million tourists visit Massachusetts each year, with 10 million visiting the Boston area annually. Fulfilling the potential of the Harbor Islands will strengthen tourism and significantly benefit the local economy, as well as enhance the experience of visitors to the area.

As recommended by the Park Service study, to fulfill that potential, we must improve public access to the islands and adopt a coordinated approach to their management. This legislation calls on the National Park Service to work closely with State and local governments and nonprofit organizations to preserve the natural and cultural resources of the islands and make them more accessible to the public through the use of a public water transportation system. The bill establishes a partnership among the various levels of government, and requires a commitment of non-Federal funds on at least a three-to-one matching basis with Federal funds. It does not involve any substantial purchase of land by the Federal Government; instead, it authorizes the Park Service to develop cooperative agreements with the State, local and private owners of the islands to ensure their protection and expanded public use.

The Boston Harbor Islands will be an exceptional addition to the National Park System. Their natural beauty and historical significance eminently merit this protection and preservation. The partnership approach will keep Federal costs to a minimum and assure the success of this effort for generations to come. I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

By Mrs. KASSEBAUM:

S. 1477. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and the Public Health Service Act to improve the regulation of food, drugs, devices, and biological products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

THE FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION PERFORMANCE AND ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 1995

● Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, I introduce the Food and Drug Administration Performance and Accountability Act of 1995. This comprehensive reform bill is designed to ensure that Americans continue to enjoy and our Nation continues to lead the world in the development of new, life-saving and life-enhancing pharmaceuticals and medical devices and wholesome, abundant, and affordable foods by reforming the role of the Food and Drug Administration in the testing and review of new products.

Over the years, the FDA's requirements for clinical testing and its premarket reviews of new products have grown increasingly complex, time-consuming, and expensive. From the 1960's to the 1990's, for example, the time required to complete clinical trials for new drugs has grown from 2½ years to nearly 6 years. From the beginning of the process to the end, it takes an average of 12 years and costs $359 million to bring a new drug to market. By law, the FDA is required to review and act on applications to market new drugs and devices within 180 days. Today, however, it takes the agency on average 649 days to complete its review of new devices and 570 days to complete its review of most new drugs.

These increasing FDA demands on new product development and delays in new product reviews are reducing incentives for research and development, encouraging American companies to locate abroad, delaying Americans' access to new pharmaceuticals and medical devices, and costing American jobs.

The legislation I am introducing today is designed to correct these problems. First, the bill makes clear that a prime mission of the FDA is facilitating the rapid and efficient development and availability of safe and effective products that will benefit the public. It puts the agency on notice that Congress and the American people expect it to allocate its time, energy, and resources accordingly.

Second, the bill puts teeth into statutory deadlines for agency action. The FDA commissioner is required, in consultation with patient advocacy groups and the regulated industries, to establish and meet yearly performance standards that will bring the agency into compliance and keep it in compliance with statutory deadlines for action on premarket approval applications. The commissioner will be required to report yearly on the agency's performance and, if the agency is out of compliance, to contract with outside experts for product reviews.

Third, to ensure that desperately ill and suffering patients have access to promising new therapies, the bill will expand access to investigational new pharmaceuticals and medical devices. To ensure that physicians are as fully informed as possible about these new therapies and about new uses for already approved therapies, the bill will ease the agency's current severe restrictions on the dissemination of information about them.

Fourth, the bill establishes a collaborative clinical testing and review process. It requires the agency to meet with companies in the early stage of the clinical testing to establish the parameters for testing and avoid last-minute changes in protocol designs once testing is underway. Once testing has been completed and the agency receives an application for product approval, the agency would again be required to meet with companies to better ensure the smooth and timely review of the application.

Fifth, the bill provides the agency with the statutory flexibility it needs to make changes in its clinical testing policies and product review procedures. For example, it modifies current law, which appears now to require two or more clinical studies, to permit the agency to base its approval on one well-designed clinical study when appropriate. As further examples, the bill updates outmoded statutory requirements for the regulation of biological products, reduces the number of medical devices that the agency is required to review, and makes it easier for the agency to use national and internationally recognized performance standards in evaluating the safety and effectiveness of devices.

In these and in a number of other ways, the FDA Performance and Accountability Act of 1995 will transform the FDA from a growing barrier to innovation into an active partner in innovation.●

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 581

At the request of Mr. FAIRCLOTH, the name of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GRASSLEY] was added as a cosponsor of S. 581, a bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act and the Railway Labor Act to repeal those provisions of Federal law that require employees to pay union dues or fees as a condition of employment, and for other purposes.

S. 981

At the request of Mr. EXON, the name of the Senator from California [Mrs. BOXER] was added as a cosponsor of S. 981, a bill entitled ''Truck Safety and Congressional Partnership Act''.

S. 1030

At the request of Mr. REID, the name of the Senator from Maine [Ms. SNOWE] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1030, a bill entitled the ''Federal Prohibition of Female Genital Mutilation Act of 1995.

S. 1212

At the request of Mr. COATS, the name of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BRADLEY] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1212, a bill to provide for the establishment of demonstration projects designed to determine the social, civic, psychological, and economic effects of providing to individuals and families with limited means an opportunity to accumulate assets, and to determine the extent to which an asset-based welfare policy may be used to enable individuals and families with low income to achieve economic self-sufficiency.

S. 1392

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the name of the Senator from Maine [Mr. COHEN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1392, a bill to impose temporarily a 25 percent duty on imports of certain Canadian wood and lumber products, to require the administering authority to initiate an investigation under title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to such products, and for other purposes.

S. 1419

At the request of Mrs. KASSEBAUM, the name of the Senator from Maine [Ms. SNOWE] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1419, a bill to impose sanctions against Nigeria.

S. 1470

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the names of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BIDEN] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. WARNER] were added as cosponsors of S. 1470, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for increases in the amounts of allowable earnings under the Social Security earnings limit for individuals who have attained retirement age, and for other purposes.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 43

At the request of Mr. SANTORUM, his name was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 43, a joint resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding Wei Jingsheng; Gedhun Choekyi Nyima, the next Panchen Lama of Tibet; and the human rights practices of the Government of the People's Republic of China.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 35—RELATIVE TO BOSNIA

Mrs. HUTCHISON (for herself, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. KYL, Mr. LOTT, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BURNS, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. COATS, Mr. D'AMATO, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. FAIRCLOTH, Mr. FRIST, Mr. GRAMS, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HELMS, Mr. KEMPTHORNE, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. PRESSLER, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. SMITH, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. THOMPSON, and Mr. THURMOND) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was considered and not agreed to:

S. CON. RES. 35

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),

SECTION 1. EXPRESSING OPPOSITION TO THE DEPLOYMENT DECISION.

The Congress opposes President Clinton's decision to deploy United States military ground forces into the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina to implement the General Framework Agreement for Peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina and its associated annexes.

SEC. 2 EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR UNITED STATES MILITARY PERSONNEL WHO ARE DEPLOYED.

The Congress strongly supports the United States military personnel who may be ordered by the President to implement the General Framework Agreement for Peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina and its associated annexes.

SEC. 3. TRANSMITTAL OF RESOLUTION.

The Secretary of the Senate shall transmit a copy of this concurrent resolution to the President.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 36—DIRECTING THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

Mr. LEVIN submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. CON. RES. 36

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That in the enrollment of the bill S. 1060, to provide for the disclosure of lobbying activities to influence the Federal Government, and for other purposes, the Secretary of the Senate shall make the following corrections:

(1) In section 6(8), strike ''6'' and insert ''7''.

(2) In section 9(7), insert ''and'' after the semicolon, in section 9(8), strike ''; and'' and insert a period, and strike paragraph (9) of section 9.

(3) In section 12(c), strike ''7'' and insert ''6''.

(4) In section 15(a)(2), strike ''8'' and insert ''7''.

(5) In section 15(b)(1), strike '', 5(a)(2),'' and in section 15(b)(2), strike ''8'' and insert ''7''.

(6) In section 24(b), strike ''13, 14, 15, and 16'' and insert ''9, 10, 11, and 12''.

(7) In section 12(b)(1), strike ''7'' and insert in lieu thereof ''6''.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

SIMPSON (AND CRAIG) AMENDMENT NO. 3098

Mr. BROWN (for Mr. SIMPSON, for himself and Mr. CRAIG) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 116) directing the Secretary of the Senate to make technical corrections in the enrollment of S. 1060; as follows:

On page 2, after line 10 insert the following: (7) In section 18, strike ''contract, loan, or any other form'' and insert ''or loan''.

(8) In section 12(b)(1), strike ''7'' and insert ''6''.

THE AU PAIR PROGRAMS EXTENSION ACT

HELMS (AND DODD) AMENDMENT NO. 3099

Mr. BROWN (for Mr. HELMS, for himself and Mr. DODD) proposed an amendment to the bill (S. 1465) to extend au pair programs; as follows:

On line 9 strike ''1999'' and replace with ''1997''.

On line 10, strike ''1998'' and replace with ''1996''.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet on Wednesday, December 13, 1995, at 10 a.m. in open session, to consider the nomination of Mr. H. Martin Lancaster for appointment as Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full Committee on Environment and Public Works be granted permission to conduct a hearing Wednesday, December 13, at 9:30 a.m., Hearing Room (SD–406), with respect to the reauthorization of the Clean Water Act on municipal issues.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, December 13, 1995 at 2 p.m. to hold a closed hearing regarding intelligence matters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FORESTS AND PUBLIC LAND MANAGEMENT

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Forests and Public Land Management of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be granted permission to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, December 13, 1995, for purposes of conducting a subcommittee hearing which is scheduled to begin at 2:30 p.m. The purpose of this hearing is to consider S. 901, the Water Recycling Projects; S. 1013, the Garrison Diversion Unit Project; S. 1154, the Fort Peck Rural County Water Supply System Act of 1995; S. 1169, the McCall Area Wastewater Reclamation and Reuse Project, and S. 1186, the Flathead Irrigation and Power Project.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

ILLICIT DRUGS

• Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss a vital, bicameral effort to combat drugs in this country. The Task Force on National Drug Policy, of which I am a proud member, was announced today to work to solve a serious problem: narcotics.

Despite efforts by Congress to curtail the flow of drugs into this country and its use by Americans, it seems as though the results have been lost with this administration. The intent of this task force is to focus the White House on a problem that is far from being resolved, and where much attention needs to be paid.

This is particularly important in light of recent studies that have indicated a growing trend in illicit drug use among teenagers. Studies indicate that, despite a decline in drug use among teens during the 1980's, drug use has risen sharply in the past few years. Cocaine use by high school students increased 36 percent since 1991–92, which was the period of lowest use. Marijuana use increased as well. Between the 1990–92 school year and 1994, marijuana use among junior high school students rose 111 percent and rose 67 percent in high schools. Now, one in three high

Continued S 18565

school students admit to smoking marijuana.

Even without being armed with these statistics, Americans see the rise of drug use in their communities. It is on their streets and in their schools. Understandably, citizens view narcotics as one of the most pressing problems facing our country. According to a Gallup poll released yesterday, 94 percent of Americans see drug use as a serious problem or a crisis.

These recent reports are a wake-up call to the administration to take action. It has served as the impetus for this Task Force on National Drug Policy to set a framework for policy and establish strategic plans to combat the drug epidemic. This, in turn, should move the White House to realize that this is a pressing issue that they can no longer neglect. Action must be taken now. Our children cannot afford to wait any longer.

Efforts must be stepped up to get at the drug suppliers, especially the drug kingpins. They are profiting while the rest of us suffer. There presence is being tolerated and should not be tolerated anymore.

In order to control the proliferation of illegal narcotics, law enforcement efforts must play a leading role in the Federal strategy. Law enforcement agencies, experts in this field, have been able to develop innovative techniques to respond to the spread of drugs in our communities. They are on the frontlines of this war against drugs and have the knowledge to fight its recent rise.

The members of this task force have the ability to establish policy and to take the initiative through legislative action. An example of this could be the implementation of a system such as the Automated Fingerprint Identification System [AFIS]. Using this biometric system, drug smugglers will not be able to repeatedly enter this country using fictitious identification with anonymity and impunity. Recidivistic drug felons could be immediately identified, detained, and prosecuted or deported before their heinous acts impact upon our children, families, and communities. This is at least one way to reduce the flow of drugs over our borders.

Another way to deter drug dealers is to raise sentencing guidelines and enact mandatory minimums to guarantee longer sentences. These will also act as a deterrent to potential offenders. We should be attacking their trade, not ignoring their presence.

It is evident that the illegal drug trade has profited with the focus shifted away from their activities. But this task force will change that. With the emphasis placed back on narcotics and the harm it spreads, this task force may be able to concentrate efforts to rekindle the decline of drug use that was noted prior to this administration.

I would also like to take this opportunity to commend my colleagues for their leadership and initiative in the effort to control illicit drugs in the United States.●

TO HELP THOSE LIVING ON THE EDGE

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, one of the most dynamic people I have had a chance to meet in my years in public life is a Roman Catholic priest by the name of Father George Clements.

He has stirred controversy from time to time by his championing of causes that sometimes are unpopular but always, in my opinion, reflect favorably on his faith and his humanitarianism.

Recently Parade magazine had a story concerning his program of ''One Church-One-Addict'' which I ask to be printed in full in the RECORD.

What a great thing for this Nation it would be if every church in the Nation were to follow this simple admonition.

Many churches would find that they have been unable to help people, a least not immediately. But many others would find they have been the difference in keeping people from going over the edge.

The article follows:

TO HELP THOSE LIVING ON THE EDGE

(By Marie Ragghianti)

The only major institution not dealing with substance abuse is the church,'' the Rev. George Clements told me. ''Look at our prisons and universities—they're fighting drugs. We can do no less.''

For many years, Father Clements has been inspiring others to action through both his words and his deeds. In 1980, from his parish in Chicago, he started a program called One Church-One Child. His idea—for every church to place one homeless child with a family—eventually grew into a national program, and it has helped find homes for more than 50,000 children. In a controversial move, Clements himself adopted four youngsters. (The Vatican eventually supported him.) In 1987, a TV movie told his story.

Now, the 63-year-old priest has an even more ambitious mission: to help recovering addicts find support in their religious communities. Clements' new program is called One Church-One Addict, which he founded with the American Alliance for Rights and Responsibilities, a nonprofit organization based in Washington, D.C.

''If Jesus was walking around today, he'd be working in the area of substance abuse,'' Clements says when he speaks to religious groups around the country. ''Jesus lived on the cutting edge and helped others. We must do the same.''

One Church-One Addict is ecumenical: All faiths are asked to do something about drug addiction and/or alcoholism in their communities. Volunteers are trainged to give counseling and support. They meet with clients in one-on-one sessions, helping them learn how to live without drugs or alcohol. Clients usually enter the program upon leaving a rehabilitation center or clinic. They receive support for about nine months, although no time limit is set.

I asked Father Clements how he got involved in helping recovering addicts. It began, he said, with a child he once knew who lived near his church—the Holy Angels Catholic church, in the drug-plagued housing projects of Chicago's South Side.

''I wouldn't be in this work today if it wasn't for Tommy,'' Clements explained. ''Tommy was valedictorian of his eighth-grade class. He was a great football player and had won an academic scholarship to attend an excellent high school. He wanted to be an obstetrician. One evening, he asked if I thought he could make it. 'Of course you can, Tommy,' I told him. 'I have no doubt.'

''That night, after I was in bed, the phone rang. It was the emergency room a local hospital. A kid was dying. He was unconscious and didn't have any identification, but they could make out the words 'Father Clements.' I raced to the hospital. When I arrived, I found Tommy lying on a slab, dead of a drug overdose.

''After the funeral, I sat at my desk and couldn't stop crying. How could I not have known? That day, it was as if a force grabbed me by the back of the neck, and I knew I had to do something.''

Shortly after Tommy's death, Father Clements took a walk through his neighborhood. What he saw outraged him: Drug paraphernalia littered the streets and, to his astonishment, was being sold in the area's small liquor stores, pharmacies and candy shops—many of which were frequented by children. A few months later, Clements decided to organize protests. He went to a large wholesaler of drug paraphernalia and held a revival in the parking lot. The 1989 event was covered by regional media and prompted the Illinois Legislature to pass a law banning much of the paraphernalia.

For Clements, however, that victory was only the beginning: He decided that the church could no longer ignore the problem of drugs in the community. After five years of planning, One Church-One Addict was born in 1994, receiving funding through seed grants provided by nonprofit groups. Since then, 715 churches in 31 states have signed on; more than 2000 people have been helped by its network of support.

How does Father Clements compare the two programs he founded?

''I feel that One Church-One Addict is a natural outgrowth of One Church-One Child,'' he said. ''People are much more sympathetic to kids than to addicts. But I tell people that I'm not excusing or defending addiction. We say, 'Love the addict, hate the addiction.'''●

PROTECTING THE FIRST AMENDMENT

● Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I did not support the effort yesterday to begin writing exceptions into the first amendment of our Constitution. The first amendment protects the right of free speech, no matter how unpopular or offensive that speech is. The Court interprets this to include the right of people to burn a flag if a person so chooses. Presumably, the Court would reach the same conclusion with regard to a person's right to burn the Constitution or even the Bill of Rights itself.

Modern technology has given us the ability to see political protest, including the burning of flags, as it occurs around the world—in Tiananmen Square, in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, and in South Africa. We are not only able to see the political protest, we are also able to see those governments step in to prevent that expression, to limit that speech, and to silence dissent and criticism aimed at those in power.

This proposed constitutional amendment would sanction that same type of

repressive action by our own Government. And such repression would not be permitted only when people are disturbing the peace, but also when they are trying to dramatize their strongly held political views. Like most citizens, I might find many of those political views offensive. But I am not willing to amend the Constitution to permit States and the Federal Government to restrict the expression of those views.

It distresses me to see the symbol of our great Republic mocked and desecrated.

But I am not so foolish as to mutilate those values themselves. The strength of our country is in large part due to the fact that we tolerated the expression of unpopular views. It does not strengthen us as a nation to begin, by constitutional amendment, to restrict the right of political expression. It does not protect our Nation to diminish the very liberties which have made us the envy of all mankind.

Mr. President, it seems that this issue surfaces every 4 or 5 years usually before Presidential elections. We spoke about this issue before the last Presidential election and we debate the issue again now.

Mr. President, one point which has come home to me time and again since I have been in the Senate, is that the Framers of our Constitution did a marvelous thing when they wrote that document and when they added to it the Bill of Rights. Not only did they produce a document embodying our most precious values and a system of government to advance and protect those values, they also had the wisdom to anticipate the very type of effort to silence unpopular expression. They anticipated it, and they guarded against it by requiring changes in the Constitution to be accomplished only by a two-thirds vote of both the Senate and the House of Representatives, and then by the approval of three-quarters of the legislatures of our States.

Those requirements have served us well in the present debate. I am glad that the necessary two-thirds vote to approve this amendment was not achieved in this Senate. I am heartened to hear the strong statements of many of my colleagues against the amendment.

What about the public reaction to all of this? Recent polls show that a majority of Americans favor such a constitutional amendment and indicate that they would be inclined to vote against a Representative or Senator who opposed it.

I would like to believe that, given time for additional reflection, most Americans would have a different view. I would like to believe that those of us in public life have a responsibility and opportunity to persuade our fellow citizens on this issue.

Time will tell whether my beliefs are well-founded.

I cast my vote against this proposed amendment with the satisfaction of knowing that I have done what is clearly right.●

FROM POLITICS TO PARANOIA

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, recently The Washington Post had an op-ed piece by one of the finest people I have met in my four decades of public service: Abner J. Mikva.

He served in the House, served in the federal judiciary and served as counsel to President Clinton. In all three areas he served with great distinction.

I believe we should reflect on his recent op-ed piece ''From Politics to Paranoia,'' which I ask to be printed in full in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Along with Senator John GLENN and Senator JEFF BINGAMAN, I voted against the authorization of another million dollars for further Whitewater investigations by the Senate committee.

I believe it will turn out to be a waste of money. I have been appointed to that committee, perhaps because of that vote.

But much worse than the conduct of congressional committees have been the excesses of the independent counsels that have been appointed.

If I were to vote again today on that creation, I would vote against it.

I read recently that the Whitewater independent counsel is now investigating two contributions to Bill Clinton's 1990 gubernatorial race. And the independent counsel has now spent almost $25 million in pursuing every little remote lead.

Our laws should be enforced and we need independence.

My own feeling is that we should establish certain standards for the Office of Attorney General and then not have an independent counsel.

Janet Reno is independent. President Gerald Ford's appointment of Ed Levi as Attorney General was not an appointment of a close friend but rather someone genuinely independent.

Unfortunately, we have had examples of Attorneys General being appointed who are too close to the President.

But to have independent counsels that run amuck is not in our national interest.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 26, 1995]

FROM POLITICS TO PARANOIA—MISGUIDED ETHICS LAWS HAVE GIVEN US MORE MISTRUST, NOT LESS

(By Abner J. Mikva)

It probably was inevitable that after a year as White House counsel some in the media and politics would speculate that I left my job because I ''know something'' I don't want to defend. That suspicion is dead wrong. I left because I am physically tired—but in good health and humor, and I intend to stay that way.

The long hours were draining, though worth it. But far more demoralizing was what I came to see as a profound loss of faith by the American people in the government they've created. I leave public life at a time when America has grown unusually distrustful of its government and its leaders. Too many of us expect and believe the worst about government, even when no evidence exists to justify our doubts. And I've come to think that some of our intended solutions to this over the years have become the cause of the problem. We need changes in the independent counsel law and others we've created with perhaps the best of intentions.

Healthy skepticism is necessary to the continuation of our democracy. When it turns to paranoia, it becomes destructive. American history has alternated between the two—from the Watergate reformers and the anti-Federalists who opposed the new Constitution of the 1780s to the paranoia of the ''Know Nothings'' of the mid-1800s to the ''I hate Washington'' crowd of today.

What seems paradoxical about today's lack of trust is that never have people in government been obliged to disclose more about themselves. Ethics laws, freedom of information laws, conflict of interest laws and others have made public officials live in the clearest goldfish bowl ever. Federal agencies have inspectors general and designated ethics officials whose job it is to ferret out any unethical behavior, whether it is by a Cabinet secretary or a mail clerk. The independent counsel laws provides a mechanism whereby the attorney general must refer out any evidence of criminal wrongdoing by high government officials.

Yet public confidence in government—the ostensible goal of ethics legislation—is at an all-time low. Indeed the accounting often seems to further the problem by allowing critics to magnify minor blemishes into major defects.

For instance, there has been a regrettable willingness by politicians and activists in both of our major political parties to use even a hint of ethical misconduct as a political weapon against the other side. Negative political advertising has become an art form for almost every political campaign. Add to this a tendency in the public arena to exaggerate claims of impropriety, and it sometimes becomes difficult for the public to distinguish between legitimate and illegitimate charges.

The media has added to the excesses. The desire of the electronic media to use sound bites rather than reportage lends itself to the name-calling and the sensationalism that exists. The desperate nature of competition for the print media had caused many newspapers to reach for scandals and follow the lead of the most yellow-journalism rivals.

Most of the investigations that I dealt with during my time as White House counsel—Whitewater, Waco, the Travel Office, the Mexican peso crisis—were a dismaying waste to time for Congress, for the administration and for the media who kept looking for a nonexistent smoking gun.

The investigations showed that some people in government made mistakes, used bad judgment, passed the buck and displayed other human fragilities that may be worthy of comment but hardly of an inquisition. In the Waco tragedy, for example, the Department of Justice and the Treasury Department each issued candid reports on the events, including an assessment of blame for the mistakes. The congressional investigations added nothing to the public awareness except to beat up on the agencies. The same is true of the congressional Whitewater investigations where an independent counsel operation has been spending a lot of time and resources to determine whether any governmental officials engaged in wrongdoing.

I am not an apologist for human shortcomings. Once a government official steps over the ethical line, he or she should be dealt with firmly. The public must know

that we will not tolerate ethical lapses, whatever the personal consequences to the violator. But government cannot daily prove its rectitude to the cynic convinced of government's corruption. A nation where cynicism toward government prevails cannot function effectively.

Of course, a government that merely implores voters to ''trust me'' will not gain that trust, nor should it. But if our eternal rounds of inquisition and calumny tear down the public trust, and make government out to be a cesspool, if our remedies make public service so unattractive and distasteful as to lose the capacity to recruit new and good people to government—we lose the whole ballgame. We have spent so much time accusing, finger-pointing and exposing, that we have forgotten why we formed a government in the first place. We make it impossible to be governed.

And yet we are proposing additional ethics reforms, based not on what they can achieve, but rather on the political perception that something must be done. In an attempt to ''out-ethic'' the political opposition, we only make matters worse.

For example, we already require the filing of too many forms. Every year all of our senior officials spend countless hours preparing financial disclosure forms. Candidates file extensive reports on how they raise and spend their campaign money. The reports are so complicated that most reviewers can't understand what they are reviewing, but they do serve as wonderful traps to snare the unwary official.

We have lobbying laws on the books that do precious little to expose the difference between legitimate lobbying and improper use of money and favors to gain desired results. There are proposals to add further forms—ones that will do nothing to break the link between lobbying and money. We ought to concentrate our efforts on gift banning and campaign finance reform.

We ought to evoke the principle that applies to federal judges, who cannot accept anything of value from any party who has an interest in a case before that judge. The judge either refuses the gift or recuses himself from the case. It's a simple principle. Judges understand it; lawyers and their clients understand it; everyone obeys it. In the rare cases where judges violate the rule, they go to jail. What the principle does is break the link between the giving and the ruling. You can give but you cannot buy. Applied to Congress, which recently has banned gifts such as meals and trips, the principle would end the seamy business of members asking for contributions (and getting them) from person most likely to be affected by the member's actions. Obviously, such a plan would necessitate a whole new campaign finance structure, but that is long overdue anyway.

We ought to reconsider the independent counsel statute. Some may smirk that I of all people would suggest changing it, since I voted for it while in Congress and have had to live with its consequences during this past year. But fewer and fewer people in either political party now believe that it really works. The original purpose of preventing Richard Nixon and his friend and close adviser Attorney General John Mitchell from investigating themselves in the Watergate scandal has been achieved. Since then, 17 independent counsels have been appointed. Their mandates have ranged all the way from investigating whether a White House aide sniffed cocaine in a New York nightclub to whether a cabinet official understated how much money he paid to a woman with whom he had an affair. One investigation—the five-year-old probe of Department of Housing and Urban Development officials—has gone on for so long that the independent counsel announced that the main target had grown too old to pursue. One can question whether even the Iran-contra case or the Whitewater affair wouldn't have best been handled the normal way by Justice Department prosecutors.

We can do better. We need to amend the statute to provide for qualifications for the independent counsel that guarantee political independence. The counsel ought to be appointed on a full-time basis for a limited period of time. Extensions of the original period of appointment should be allowed only under very limited circumstances. The threshold for seeking an independent counsel should be raised further—to limit the appointment only to cases where it is clear that normal authority is insufficient. The selection process for the special court which appoints and supervises independent counsels should be changed to ensure both the reality and the perception of nonpolitical appointments.

From the outset, our founders recognized the tension between governing effectively and the elimination of all potential for abuse. George Washington wrote: ''No man is a warmer advocate for proper restraints and wholesome checks in every department than I am; but I have never yet been able to discover the propriety of placing it absolutely out of the power of men to render essential services, because a possibility remains of their doing ill.''

If we have all these codes of ethics and all of these disclosure laws and all of these investigating institutions and less trust with each addition to the pile, we must be doing something wrong. We need some remedies that will restore the faith.●

TRIBUTE TO JULIE MCGREGOR

● Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, frequent staff turnover is a fact of life in the Senate. In this regard, I have always considered myself exceedingly lucky. I have had many key staff members who stayed with me far beyond the average tenure and I, and the people of Oregon, have greatly benefited from their institutional knowledge and experience. But, inevitably, the day arrives when even those diehard staffers feel it is time to move on. For Julie McGregor, that day has arrived.

And so I rise to bid farewell to a longtime and valued staff member. I find it difficult to take so many years of loyalty, dedication, and friendship and wrap it into a neat one page package. Words alone simply seem inadequate to express what Julie has meant to me, to my family, and to my office.

Julie came to my office 13 years ago as an eager, bright, and intelligent intern. She departs today a wise and competent sage. In that time, Julie's role evolved from that of student to mentor. No matter how busy, she always took the time to encourage and guide less experienced colleagues. Members of the Appropriations Committee staff as well as my personal staff have relied on Julie's counsel and valued her perspective as much as I did.

One of Julie's greatest assets is her intuitive ability to cut to the heart of the matter. She thoughtfully and fairly examines all sides of an issue, but remains unerringly firm in her convictions. Even in the most emotional discussions or difficult issues, Julie is a calm voice of rationality and reason. In fact, those who don't know her well might be deceived by Julie's quiet manner or seemingly shy nature. They shouldn't be. She is extraordinarily tenacious. If you are staking a position or fighting a battle, you definitely want Julie on your side.

Julie grew up in small southern Oregon community, and those roots have served her well here. While adapting well to the rough and tumble political world in Washington, she has always kept clearly in mind the individual human beings whom we serve. She is both politically astute and compassionate, a combination of qualities that is so rare it is almost an oxymoron. Aware of the realities and limitations of the political process, Julie is unwavering in her belief that the Government can and should use its powers to improve the human condition. This is a belief that we share and one that has guided many of our legislative efforts.

While Julie, at one time or another, handled nearly every legislative issue in my office, her true calling was one that is closest to my own heart. First as a legislative assistant and later as my director of International Policy, she became an advocate for peace and a champion for humanitarian concerns. Julie's work on arms control, human rights, and nuclear proliferation issues, among others, leaves a lasting legacy in the Senate and has had an impact on us all.

Julie played a key role in one of the legislative accomplishments of which I am most proud. In 1992, we were successful in enacting legislation establishing a moratorium on nuclear testing by the United States. This nuclear test ban continues today and the United States' leadership on this issue has prompted much of the rest of the world to follow suit.

Julie has spent her entire professional career in public service, in service to the State of Oregon and to the U.S. Senate. I know that the people of Oregon, and my colleagues in the Senate, join me in expressing our gratitude for many years of exemplary work.

While we are sad to see Julie leave us, we are also excited for her as she begins a new phase in her life. This weekend she leaves Washington to join her financé, Michael Britti, in New Mexico. There will be many wonderful opportunities and adventures as Julie moves on with her career, and as she and Mike begin to build a life together.

Julie is, and always will be, a member of the Hatfield family. Antoinette and I send her off with our love and our best wishes for a future full of happiness and success.●

SCHOOL FACILITIES AND THE NEW GAO REPORT SCHOOL FACILITIES: STATES' FINANCIAL AND TECHNICAL SUPPORT VARIES

• Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Mr. President, I would like to announce the results of a study conducted by the General Accounting Office on States' efforts to improve the condition of our public school facilities.

Infrastructure needs are not cosmetic—they go directly to the safety, the suitability, and environment for learning that directly affects American students' performance in the classroom.

The GAO found that many States are doing little to address the deterioration of our schools—and what is being done varies widely from State to State. Only thirteen States take a comprehensive approach to their school infrastructure needs—by providing ongoing funding for school improvement projects, offering technical assistance to local officials, and maintaining up-to-date information on the condition of their facilities.

The GAO has documented that our schools are falling apart.

They are not ready for the Information Age because of inadequate infrastructure. More than 60 percent lack sufficient phone lines. Thirty-five percent don't even have enough electrical power to operate computers.

Last week, the Washington Post ran an article that described the condition of the bathrooms in some of the District's schools. The Post reported that many of the restrooms are in violently foul condition—unhealthy and unusable.

One parent said she could not believe the bathroom in her children's school was in the United States. I have that article and would like to submit it for the RECORD.

We have seen these problems in school buildings all over the country—in Chicago, Baltimore, New York, and Los Angeles—in rural communities, as well as in urban centers.

America cannot compete if our students cannot learn, and our students cannot learn if our schools are falling down.

Earlier this year, the GAO released a report—entitled School Facilities: The Condition of America's Schools—that looked at the facilities that millions of our children walk into every morning. In that report, the GAO documented that 13 million students attend schools that need to be extensively repaired or replaced.

The GAO estimates that it will cost $112 billion to upgrade our school facilities to a good, overall condition. This cost is growing. The longer infrastructure needs are ignored or deferred, the greater the cost will be. The situation is like that facing the owner of a home. If the roof leaks, and you find the leak early, you can patch the roof. But if you wait a few years, you find you'll need to tear out the walls or rebuild the foundation. The message couldn't be clearer—delay equals additional cost.

In the report released by the GAO today, we find out that many States are not even bothering to assess the damage or call in the building inspector.

The GAO says State support is limited and varied. In fiscal year 1994, States provided a total of $3.5 billion in grants and loans for school facilities construction—only 3.1 percent of the total funding needed.

The sum of $3.5 billion may sound like a lot, and indeed, if your child goes to school in Alaska, it is. The State of Alaska spent almost $275 million—$2,254 per pupil—in fiscal year 1994 on school construction projects. On the other end of the spectrum is my home State of Illinois. Illinois, along with 10 other States, provides no ongoing support for school facilities construction or improvement.

Today's report documents an alarming lack of knowledge about the conditions of our schools. More than half of the States have no recent information on the condition of school buildings in their States.

I mentioned a newspaper report on decaying children's bathrooms. Gerald Sigal, a major construction contractor, also read that article. He was so upset that he is forming a coalition of business leaders to fix the problem. Mr. Sigal responded to the public school bathroom crisis because he found out about it.

But most schools seldom have a major newspaper to do their reporting for them, and the only people that may know about the brown tap water and broken plumbing are the children.

Last year, Congress took a monumental step toward fixing our school facilities problem when it enacted and funded the Education Infrastructure Act. This year, however, Congress took away the money.

Mr. President, if our children do not have computers, or if they cannot see the blackboard because it has fallen off the wall, or if they cannot go to the bathroom because it stinks of sewage, or if they cannot keep warm because the heaters are broken, they cannot concentrate, and they cannot learn.

This new GAO report is essentially a report card that measures State support for education infrastructure. Very few States get a passing mark. But the schools are still falling apart. The time has come for us to step in and heal our Nation's schools.

The problem goes beyond what many local communities can handle. Many Districts cannot find more revenue because they have already been stretched to their local limits in bonding and other ways to raise money for education.

The GAO looked at whether technical assistance is available from the States to local school officials—whether local officials can count on States for help in advice and planning. Again, great disparities exist.

Florida has the equivalent of 72 people who provide guidance on planning, construction, and maintenance. New York gives workshops and publishes articles on facilities planning. But 34 States have less than 6 full time people available for this kind of assistance.

Repairing our schools is in the national interest. We must provide assistance to strapped local school districts in a way that directly benefits children. Federal support for education infrastructure allows us to help local school districts create a suitable environment for learning, without violating the tenet of local control over public education.

I urge all of my colleagues to take a close look at this new GAO study, and decide how much longer they want to leave the problem of our crumbling public school facilities to someone else.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 8, 1995]

IN D.C. SCHOOLS, IT'S TOUGH GOING—STUDENTS FIND THEMSELVES WITHOUT SOAP, TOILET PAPER OR PRIVACY

(By Sari Horwitz)

Children in public schools across the District often use dirty bathrooms that lack private stalls, soap, paper towels and even toilet paper.

The restrooms in even some of the city's most highly regarded public schools are in such poor shape that parents fear they are unhealthy for children, and educators say they are interfering with learning.

One of those schools is Horace Mann Elementary in well-to-do upper Northwest Washington, a school that has won awards from the U.S. Department of Education. Many days, second-grader Peter Joyce and his schoolmate Joe Takesuye won't use the boys' bathroom because of the filth and overpowering stench of urine. They hold it until they get home.

''The bathrooms really smell,'' said Peter, 7. ''They are dirty. There's paper towels all over the floor, spitballs on the walls and the water from the sink is like, brown. It looks gross.''

Horace Mann Principal Sheila Ford said she doesn't have the money to improve the 64-year-old building's plumbing. But she's looking for resources because the bathroom problem is spilling into her classrooms as the odors creep into her halls.

''When I need to use the lavatory and I'm away from one, my concentration is eliminated.'' Ford said. ''It is the same for children.''

Dirty, dilapidated school bathrooms are a problem in urban schools across the nation and are worsening as buildings age and resources for maintenance diminish, according to officials. Almost one-third of the nation's school buildings were built before World War II.

In a world where educational dollars are getting stretched ridiculously thin, bathrooms stand at the end of the line,'' said Michael Casserly, executive director of the Council of Great City Schools, which represents the nations largest school districts. ''They've really fallen off the radar screen in terms of priority.''

The bathroom problem, however, does not appear to be as serious in other school systems in the Washington area as it is in the District, according to parent activists in Fairfax, Montgomery and Prince George's countries.

Open the door to the only bathroom for 140 little boys in 127-year-old Stevens Elementary in downtown Washington, and the

stench of urine is overwhelming. The dank bathroom with rusting, corroded pipes is in the basement, and the windows remain shut for security reasons.

''It kind of holds the odors in,'' said the school's new principal, Gloria Henderson, who has been trying unsuccessfully to have a hole cut in the wall and an exhaust fan installed.

The bathroom problem in D.C. schools is not all old age.

Parents and educators said that in many schools, clean , fully stocked and functioning bathrooms are simply not a priority in a school system saddled with other problems and budget woes. Hundreds of D.C. students still do not even have textbooks.

This fall, parents at Watkins Elementary School, on Capitol Hill, were stunned to discover there were no working sinks in the girls' or boys' bathrooms on the first, second and third floors, in some cases since last January, according to parent Samuel Brylawski.

''Here you have a school full of kids who don't wash their hands after they go to the bathroom,'' Brylawski said. ''It took parents nine months to be informed. Fundamental sanitary practices were not a high priority.''

Some repairs were made after Brylawski wrote a letter to the superintendent and the public health commission, he said.

Mary Levy, counsel to Parents United, a parents advocacy group, said the low priority for maintaining bathrooms reflects officials' lack of concern of children. ''Every door should be taken off the stalls of the buildings with elected officials until they fix the doors for children,'' she said.

Bathroom water is the issue at Langdon Elementary School, in Northeast Washington. PTA president Vivian Whitaker said only cold water comes out of the bathroom sinks, and it's dirty brown.

''I wouldn't recommend the children wash their hands,'' Whitaker said.

School officials said it's hard to maintain heavily used bathrooms, especially when students dirty them or break equipment. Parents said students are less likely to violate clean, working restrooms.

At schools where bathroom repairs have been made, such as Wilson High School and J.F. Cook Elementary, it has made all the difference, they said.

Three years ago, D.C. public schools hired a consulting firm to study its buildings. The firm found serious problems in bathroom piping and toilets, including old sewage pipes rusted beyond repair, poor lighting and missing or defective toilet stalls and urinals.

In seven schools, the plumbing was called ''hazardous.'' The plumbing system at Francis Junior High, with ''extensive leaking and clogged pipes'' was called ''unacceptable.'' At Browne Junior High, the report called for ''immediate replacement'' of all the plumbing. As of July, 75 D.C. schools needed repairs, including new or fixed sinks, according to a school document. An additional 13 schools needed toilet partitions so students could use them with privacy.

At one on that list, Duke Ellington School of the Arts in Georgetown, student Zavi Ball, 16, described the bathrooms last week as ''disgusting, horrible.''

''There's never any paper towels or soap,'' she said. ''There's no warm water to wash your hands. There's hardly ever toilet paper. There's dirty feminine products on the floor and roaches. Whenever guests come, they clean the bathrooms up. But when it's just us, they don't care. When I come to school at 8 in the morning, the bathroom is already dirty.''

Facilities and Management Director William McAfee did not return phone calls. But school spokeswoman Beverly Lofton said building repair funds were very tight.

With a more than half-billion-dollar budget, the District spends $7,673 a year for each of its students, one of the highest per-pupil operating costs in the country. But most of the capital funds for building upkeep and repairs have been used for repairing fire hazards, Lofton said.

''We don't want our kids going to schools that don't have functioning bathrooms,'' Lofton said. ''We want them to have the best of everything, including partitions and sinks that work. But there is a lack of capital money to repair everything that breaks when it happens.

''We do recognize we have problems with bathrooms in the school systems'' she said. ''Bathrooms are a priority for the coming year.''

Principal Rosalie Huff of Anthony Bowen Elementary School, in Southwest, tired of waiting. When the school system hadn't replaced her broken toilets and missing partitions in 12 bathrooms by the beginning of this school year, she bought five new toilets and partitions herself.

''I had a situation that was really awful,'' Huff said. ''It didn't allow any type of basic human dignity for the girls. You were just sitting out if you had to use the toilets.''

Consumer advocate Ralph Nader wants the Appleseed Foundation, a public interest law center he helped create, to work to improve the District's school bathrooms. He got fired up about dirty, dysfunctional restrooms after listening to complaints from students at Alice Deal Junior High. ''They said their bathrooms were filthy,'' Nader said. ''There was no soap, no privacy and no toilet paper. And they said they held it. But the faculty restrooms were immaculate. It's so disgraceful.''

A visit to Deal last week revealed boys' and girls' bathrooms missing doors on the stalls and partitions between toilets, sinks that don't work properly and boys' restrooms filled with an overwhelming stench. A school worker said the odor came from toilets that leak and sewage that sits in rusty, corroded pipes.

At Horace Mann, PTA president Jane Joyce said she was so fed up with the bathrooms that she raised the issue at the first parents meeting in September. About 30 parents volunteered to come in on a Saturday and scrub the floors, bring in toilet paper and make repairs.

That helped for a while. A few weeks ago, parent Joan Murray ventured into one of the school bathrooms to see if it really was as bad as her two children described.

''I wouldn't use it,'' Murray said. ''It was more than horrendous. It was disgusting. There were paper towels everywhere, no flushed toilets and no soap. The water didn't come out of the spigots. And it smelled. I couldn't believe it was in the United States.''●

AMBASSADOR JOSEPH VERNER REED'S ADDRESS TO INTERPARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE

● Mr. PELL. Mr. President, in October, Ambassador Joseph Verner Reed represented U.N. Secretary General Boutros Boutros Ghali at the 94th Inter-Parliamentary Conference in Bucharest, Romania.

At the Conference, Ambassador Reed delivered an exceptional speech concerning the current financial crisis at the United Nations. As a longtime friend and supporter of the United Nations, I can think of no issue more important to the U.N.'s future. Moreover, the United Nation's fiscal health has critical implications for our own country's foreign and domestic agenda.

In his address, Ambassador Reed—formerly one of the United States' most accomplished diplomats and now a high-ranking U.N. official—made a compelling argument about the necessity for resolving this crisis. I commend the speech to my colleagues and ask that excerpts be printed in the RECORD.

The excerpts of the speech follows:

Mr. President, the fiftieth anniversary of the United Nations has arrived at one of the turning points in modern history.

The United Nations is the only machinery we have for collective cooperation among all Nations. It is the only global tool for promoting peace and security. It is the only worldwide institution for furthering development. It is the only universal mechanism for protecting human rights. It is the only shared framework for strengthening international law.

But today I feel compelled to share my distress with you on a subject which is unavoidable, the survival of the United Nations. For almost four years, we have tried to convince the governments of member states of the United Nations to pay their assessments on time. For four years we have warned of the financial consequences of the failure to pay assessments. We have argued, we have pleaded.

The organization has cut expenses. We have streamlined operations. We are working hard to reduce waste, duplication and overlap. Peace-keeping is expensive. The operation in the former Yugoslavia costs five million dollars per day.

In Every major statement and document of the Secretary-General, he has drawn attention to the financial crisis and proposed steps to remedy it. In meeting after meeting with foreign ministers and heads of state over these years, he has pleaded with them to address this deteriorating situation.

As of October 1995, 70 countries had not paid their regular budget assessment. Today, the United Nations is owed a total of $3.4 billion by its member states.

I appeal to you as parliamentarians to help me resolve this crisis. I ask you to try to convince your governments to pay their arrears, and to pay future contributions on time, and in full.

I make this appeal to you because the United Nations is your organization. I make this appeal here because without peace, and without the global efforts of peace, and without the global efforts of the United Nations, all your efforts for development will be to no avail.

The United Nations is not one of the luxuries of international life. The work of the United Nations is of vital, critical importance:

Saving children from starvation and disease.

Providing food, clothing and shelter for refugees.

Delivering humanitarian relief to devastated areas.

Working to stop the cycle of natural disasters in lands repeatedly afflicted by them.

Countering the new international threats of crimes, drugs, disease.

Defending human rights in individual cases as well as through international commitments.

Advising, training, monitoring and institution-building in countries seeking to democratize.

Maintaining ceasefires, preventing conflicts from erupting, peacemaking between

adversaries and peace-building in devastated countries.

These activities are going on now. They are being conducted on the ground in locations all over the world. They are carried out by dedicated, hard-working national and international staff members.

The financial crisis is being felt on the frontlines of all these efforts. If emergency measures to restore the financial health are not taken quickly, human suffering will dramatically increase. People will die. The structural ability of the United Nations to continue this work will be damaged. It will not soon or easily be reconstructed, if ever.

Unless substantial assessment payments are received by the end of November 1995, the Secretary-General will have no choice but to request that an emergency special session of the United Nations General Assembly be convened immediately to consider the financial crisis—and future of the organization.

The financial crisis of the United Nations is now destroying its very foundations. We can no longer pretend otherwise. That is why we appeal today to you—the world's parliamentarians for assistance. You must be our voice. You must be our advocate. You must be the protectors of our common future.

Mr. President, this is an emergency—the Secretary-General and all of us in the secretariat believe that positive change can be achieved, and he is convinced that this change can be the vehicle for fulfilling the aims and aspirations of the charter. He is convinced that working together in partnership we can save succeeding generations from the scourge of war; we can enhance the dignity and worth of the human person; and we can promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom.●

POLLS GET IN THE WAY OF WASHINGTON'S WORK

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, the Post and Courier, a Charleston South Carolina newspaper, recently had an op-ed piece by our colleague from South Carolina that is typical in its FRITZ HOLLINGS' bluntness, but also typical in its FRITZ HOLLINGS' wisdom.

Two points in his op-ed piece need to be stressed over and over again. One is that you cannot lead by taking polls.

You lead by studying the issues and having some conviction and doing something. Leadership that simply follows the polls is leadership in name only.

At all levels of government, we need much more leadership of conviction. If we believe we are going to satisfy the public and turn away their cynicism by some of the gimmicks that we use, we are only fooling ourselves. I agree with the limitations on lobbying and I favor a much improved system of financing political campaigns, but if these things happen but we continue to govern by polls rather than by looking at the national needs, we will get nowhere.

The second part of this statement is a recognition that we need to get additional revenue for the federal government.

He says accurately, ''We have fiscal cancer and nobody wants to talk about it.'' He goes on and says bluntly, ''To put a tourniquet on this deficit-debt hemorrhage, we need spending cuts, spending freezes, a closing of tax loopholes, denying new programs and tax increases.''

Our highways are deteriorating compared to those in Western Europe when not too many years ago it was the other way around.

We have a much higher percentage of our children living in poverty than any of the Western Europeans countries.

We are the only western industrialized country that doesn't protect all of our citizens with health care insurance.

These things take revenue, and people in this body and in the Administration ought to be talking much more candidly to the American public.

I commend our colleague, Senator HOLLINGS, for being blunt and telling us the truth in this article which I ask to be printed in full in the RECORD. The article follows:

[From the Post and Courier, Nov. 15, 1995]

POLLS GET IN THE WAY OF WASHINGTON'S WORK

(By Senator Ernest F. Hollings)

The silent scandal that permeates Washington is the pollster charade. As in Newsweek's Conventional Wisdom Watch, today's Washington is based on who's up and who's down in the polls. Everyone—the president, Congress and the media—participates. The result? Nothing gets done and no one really expects anything to get done. Meanwhile, the nation's real needs are ignored. There is no genuine plan to guide us. And plans to put us on a pay-as-you-go basis are simply pollster-driven budget schemes fashioned to get politicians past the next election.

John F. Kennedy started it all 35 years ago in West Virginia. Lou Harris' polls identified hot-button issues of concern and Jack Kennedy played them like a Stradivarius. Political polling immediately became the order of the day. Now even the media wittingly are the engines behind the oppressive reliance on polls. No longer do reporters bow to the who, what, where, when, how and why of fact and accuracy. Instead, they kowtow to pollsters to elicit pithy partisan responses that stem from polls.

The pollster begins each day with ''divide and conquer.'' Voters immediately are divided into age, sex, race, education, working or retired, married or single, veteran or military, city, suburb or rural. No one is considered an American. They have to be Asian-American, African-American, Irish-American.

Division is the pollster mentality, but dissembling is the pollster's art. No pollster has served a day in office. But they'll tell you in a minute that you can't break the Sacred Code of the Pollster. If you want to get—and stay—in office:

Never take a firm position. If you do, you'll divide voters.

Favoring a proposition will put you at odds with those who oppose.

Opposing will separate you and those who favor.

To influence the most voters possible, firmly say that you're ''concerned'' about any issue so you appear understanding and appease both sides.

Aha! Now any way you slice it, you've identified with the voter. With this kind of soundbite mentality permeating the airwaves, it's easy to understand why there is no leadership in Washington.

Lee Atwater taught that negative politics is the positive path to political victory. As a result, one of the first ''musts'' for a candidate today is to order negative research on opponents—and himself. Why? To have a prepared answer for any past mistakes or inconsistencies and to be able to unload on an opponent at the end of the campaign when voters finally are interested and there's no time to respond.

Pollsters also teach both incumbents and challengers to preach change. That's why all candidates sound the same. Republicans and Democrats are all for cutting spending and against taxes; for prisons and against crime; for jobs and against welfare; for education and the environment. And, of course, everyone is for the family. With this emphasis on change and negative politics, the logic of the pollster paradigm is that government is the enemy and problem, not the solution. As such, everyone serving in government must be ousted. Thus, there's the cry for term limits.

The media's job is to expose this nonsense. But instead of living up to this responsibility, the media have joined the scam. They feast on polls and partisanship. Rather than reporting the news of the day, they make the news with their own polls. Questions by reporters don't delve into an issue but focus on the poll or partisan aspects of the issue. What they want is conflict.

These days, the pollster charade in the media continues with the ludicrous notion that spending cuts alone can eliminate the deficit. Or worse—that cutting taxes can eliminate the deficit. Nothing could be further from the truth. Since Ronald Reagan's ''voodoo'' that tax cuts could bring in more revenue and eliminate the deficit, the national debt quintupled from less that $1 trillion to almost $5 trillion. And instead of eliminating waste in government, we created the biggest waste of all—$348 billion a year in interest costs. Since we can't avoid paying interest costs, we borrow a billion dollars daily, which automatically increases spending a billion, increases the debt a billion and increases interest costs. Every day the cycle starts again.

Both President Clinton's and Speaker Gingrich's budget plans to get rid of this waste are mere ruses to get past next year's election. But Washington politicians figure—who cares? Who will be around seven years from now? And the media lets them get by with it. Our 1995 budget was $1.52 trillion. The 1996 Clinton budget is $1.63 trillion. The 1996 Gingrich congressional budget is $1.60 trillion. Both budgets increase spending. Neither keeps up with the $1 billion daily increase in the national debt. Over the seven years, spending exceeds revenues by more than $1 trillion. The media know this yet continue to report ''a balanced budget by the year 2002.''

Now comes the bogus proposal to balance the budget by reducing cost-of-living increases for Social Security and by raiding Medicare. By law, Social Security funds are in trust and are not to be used to offset the deficit. Similarly, the Medicare trust fund for hospital costs is in the black, but may go into the red by 2002. In other words, both Social Security and Medicare are paid for and in surplus. What is not paid for this minute is defense, education, farm subsidies, environmental protection, veterans' benefits, law enforcement—general government. We readily increase billions for defense and other programs but are unwilling to pay for it. Thus continues the borrowing, spending and downward spiral that increases the deficit. We have fiscal cancer and nobody wants to talk about it.

To put a tourniquet on this deficit-debt hemorrhage, we need spending cuts, spending freezes, a closing of tax loopholes, denying new programs and tax increases. But proposals to do this go unreported. As such, the

public believes spending cuts alone will do the job. And the media validate bogus plans to cut taxes as serious moves to balance the budget. That we really are broke is ignored.

Rather than being pollster pawns, the media should serve as an institutional memory to give up perspective. With the Cold War over, it's time to rebuild our economy. More than ever, a strong government is needed—for education, job training, research, housing, transportation, technical development and inner-city needs.

But the media treat government as the enemy.

In a silent conspiracy with pollsters and Washington politicians, the media masquerade opinion polls as fact and validate the politics that any tax increase is poison. All the time, the rebuilding of America goes wanting and neither the Clinton nor the Dole/Gingrich forces can talk sense. The train wreck is a media production.●

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BROWN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HUTCHISON). The Senator from Colorado is recognized.

OUR TROOPS WILL SPEND CHRISTMAS IN BOSNIA

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, as I came over here tonight for the vote, I could feel the light snow and the chill of the wind. It made me think of the weather that the young men and women who we are sending to Bosnia will experience during their Christmas—the 19- and 20-year-old young men and women who love their country, and they will give their very lives if called upon to serve. They will spend this Christmas thousands of miles away from home, in the outskirts of Tuzla, Bosnia—and they will do it gladly.

In the idealism of youth, they will know that they are serving their country, and they will carry with it an enthusiasm that tells them they would do anything to serve this Nation and to preserve our freedom.

I cannot help but remember the words of a movie that perhaps some have forgotten, a movie that some of the critics laughed at. Sylvester Stallone played the part of a man trying to free POW's in Vietnam. When he came back from the mission that some of the leaders had tried to thwart, he was asked by his commanding colonel what in the world he wanted. The words he spoke in the movie were: ''I want what every man who served in Vietnam wanted; I want my country to love me as much as I love my country.''

Tonight we have decided to send young men and women into harm's way, and into a cause that is not clearly defined, and into a mission that is full of risk. But they will go, and they will go gladly. They will make us proud.

Madam President, that love of country and that willingness to serve, to go anywhere and do anything for us, deserves more than a casual commitment from the leaders in this country; it deserves leaders that love those men and women as much as they love us. It deserves a commitment from us that is comparable to theirs. It is a commitment we should not take lightly. We should not send young men and women to their death without being fully resolved that what they might die for is worth the price.

I do not believe that the mission that has been outlined is worth that price, and I do not believe that our leaders have that commitment. But the decision has been made. Those young men and women go with our prayers, and I will think of them this Christmas, away from home and facing what may be the saddest part of anyone's life—the chance of giving their lives for a mission that their country may not care about. That surely is the toughest burden that any young man or any young woman may ever have to face. I only pray, now that the decision is made and the troops are on the way, that we will not forget them, that we will stand beside them, that we will not deny them the weapons they need, that we will not refuse to go after the people who shoot after them, and that we will spare no effort.

My heart was filled with joy when I heard the reaction of the French President when the French pilots, who had been taken prisoner, were not returned. He made it very clear that France would not accept their men not being returned in any way, or under any circumstances. Because he stood firm, those boys were returned. He stood up for his troops and he stood beside them.

I only pray that this Nation will have the courage to do as much for those young men and women whose lives we put on the line.

I yield the floor.

Mr. PRESSLER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota is recognized.

SENDING TROOPS TO BOSNIA IS A MISTAKE

Mr. PRESSLER. Madam President, I would like to say that I feel very strongly that the basic decision to send troops to Bosnia, under the circumstances, is a mistake. I voted today for the Hutchison resolution, and I did so as a Vietnam veteran, as one who served in the Army in Vietnam. I feel strongly that we have made a mistake by sending troops to Bosnia.

Certainly, all of us want our troops to be well cared for and well equipped, but I oppose the basic decision to send troops there. Indeed, from my State, in the National Guard callup, 1 of 8 people who have been called up so far, probably to go to Bosnia, is a nephew of mine. And he will willingly serve his country, just as I did. But I disagree with the basic decision to send troops there and have so voted today.

Those were not easy votes, and I feel that the last vote was more or less papering over the whole decision, so I voted against that resolution. I feel very strongly, and my constituents feel, that we are engaging in an adventure from which we will not be able to get out of easy, and if we do get out of it, it will be with a large foreign aid bill.

There has been fighting in that country since the 15th century, and it has continued largely because foreign armies have come every time they have had a civil war, and it has never been resolved. That will probably be the case again.

So, Madam President, I wish to state that, certainly, we all care a great deal for our troops. One of them is going to be my nephew. I make my decision based on experience as a lieutenant in the Army in Vietnam. I just do not think this will work. That is the reason I voted as I did today.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT—CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1977

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate considers the conference report to accompany H.R. 1977, the Interior appropriations bill, that it be considered under the following time limitation: There be 6 hours for debate on the conference report, with 3 hours under the control of Senator GORTON or his designee, and 3 hours under the control of Senators BUMPERS and BRADLEY or their designees with 20 minutes of Senator GORTON's time under the control of Senator BYRD; that when the time is used or yielded back, the Senate proceed to vote on adoption of the conference report with the above occurring without intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CORRECTION OF ENROLLMENT OF S. 1060

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 116 that has just been received from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 116) directing the Secretary of the Senate to make technical corrections in the enrollment of S. 1060.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to proceeding to the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

AMENDMENT NO. 3098

(Purpose: To add a technical correction)

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I send an amendment to the desk on behalf of Senators SIMPSON and CRAIG.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. BROWN] for Mr. SIMPSON, for himself, and Mr. CRAIG, proposes an amendment numbered 3098.

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 2, after line 10, insert the following:

(7) In section 18, strike ''contract, loan, or any other form'' and insert ''or loan''.

(8) In section 12(b)(1), strike ''7'' and insert ''6''.

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam President, I rise, along with Senator CRAIG, to offer an amendment to H.Con.Res. 116, the resolution to make technical corrections to the recently-passed lobbying reform legislation, S. 1060. We understand that our amendment is acceptable to the managers of the lobbying reform legislation, Senators LEVIN and COHEN, and we are grateful to each of them for their cooperation.

In explaining our technical amendment, we note that three versions of the Simpson-Craig lobbying reform amendment have passed the Senate. The first was our amendment to S. 1060, banning all forms of Federal fund transfers, including contracts, to organizations described in Internal Revenue Code section 501(c)(4) who also engage in lobbying activities. Part of the rationale for this amendment was that those organizations should not simultaneously enjoy the benefits of exemption from taxation, unlimited expenditures on lobbying, and Federal funding support.

However, learning of a quirk in the legislative history of 501(c)(4) organizations, we found that many insurance companies are still technically organized as 501(c)(4) organizations, even though they are now fully taxable. Many of these, along with other health care providers that are also 501(c)(4) organizations, handle Federal contracts under Medicare, the Federal employees health system, and CHAMPUS. We believe that our colleagues would concur that such groups lie outside the scope of the intended reach of a cutoff of grant money to organizations which enjoy the benefits of 501(c)(4) status.

It is for this reason that we redrafted our amendment, during consideration of the Treasury-Postal appropriations bill, to correct for this and to exclude contracts from the prohibition on Federal funding assistance. That amendment passed the Senate by voice vote on July 24 of this year.

The third version of this provision to pass the Senate was included in a broader version of grants reform, which was the Simpson-Craig amendment to the provision authored by Representatives ISTOOK, MCINTOSH, and EHRLICH that the House had included in House Joint Resolution 115, the second FY 1996 continuing resolution. In the language in that amendment affecting 501(c)(4) organizations, we also took out the ban on contracts and other forms of funding, other than grants.

Mr. CRAIG. Senator SIMPSON has pointed out the important fact that versions of the Simpson-Craig lobbying reform amendment have been approved by the Senate three times this year. I commend Senator SIMPSON on his leadership in this area and am happy that the Simpson-Craig amendment, along with the rest of the lobbying reform bill, is on the verge of being signed into law.

The first version of our amendment, added to S. 1060, had a scope and impact on some insurance and health care providers, uniquely classified as 501(c)(4) organizations, that the authors and the Senate never intended. This problem was corrected in the second and third versions of the Simpson-Craig amendment. Therefore, the Senate twice approved the very change in our 501(c)(4) organizations language that we are proposing again today.

For reasons totally unrelated to this change, the House of Representatives struck the second and third, perfected, Simpson-Craig lobbying reform amendments from the Treasury-Postal bill and the continuing resolution. The House was seeking, instead, to promote its broader Istook-McIntosh-Ehrlich language. However, even in that House language, 501(c)(4) organizations were never barred from receiving contracts.

So, Madam President, the intent of the Senate is clear throughout the evolution of floor votes on three bills, and the intent of the House is clear in two floor votes on a related provision. Neither body intends that all 501(c)(4) organizations who lobby should be barred from receiving Federal contracts. But because the earliest version of either body's position on lobbying and grant reform was the one preserved in S. 1060 as cleared by the House, the clear intent of both bodies on 501(c)(4) organizations is not reflected in that bill.

That is all we are proposing in our technical amendment today, that this technical corrections resolution adjust S. 1060 to reflect the clear intent of both the Senate and the House, as expressed in the relevant votes taken in both bodies.

Mr. SIMPSON. The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CRAIG] is correct. While we are pleased that the House passed lobbying reform legislation with the original Simpson-Craig language intact, we also believe that Congress would want to take the opportunity, in the form of this technical corrections resolution, to acknowledge the unique status of certain 501(c)(4) organizations, as we did in our redrafted amendment to the Treasury-Postal appropriations bill and the second continuing resolution. We therefore submit our amendment to eliminate the terms ''contracts'' and ''any other form'' to the Senate, trusting that the correcting language will more closely conform to the intentions of the Congress in passing our original amendment.

Mr. CRAIG. There is one additional provision in our amendment, at the request of the bill's managers, to simplify and expedite the process of handling this resolution. This provision would correct, in section 12(b)(1) of the bill, a cross-reference to the definition for representation of a foreign entity. This same change was already made in section 12(c), and the change in section 12(b)(1) simply makes it consistent and correct, clerically.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 3098) was agreed to.

Mr. BROWN. I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be considered and agreed to, as amended, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the concurrent resolution appear at the appropriate place in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

So the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 116), as amended, was agreed to.

CORRECTION OF ENROLLMENT OF S. 1060

Mr. FORD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Senate Conurrent Resolution 36, a concurrent resolution introduced earlier today by Senator LEVIN; that the resolution be read and adopted; that the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

So the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 36) was agreed to, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 36

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That in the enrollment of the bill S. 1060, to provide for the disclosure of lobbying activities to influence the Federal Government, and for other purposes, the Secretary of the Senate shall make the following corrections:

(1) In section 6(8), strike ''6'' and insert ''7''.

(2) In section 9(7), insert ''and'' after the semicolon, in section 9(8), strike ''; and'' and insert a period, and strike paragraph (9) of section 9.

(3) In section 12(c), strike ''7'' and insert ''6''.

(4) In section 15(a)(2), strike ''8'' and insert ''7''.

(5) In section 15(b)(1), strike '', 5(a)(2),'' and in section 15(b)(2), strike ''8'' and insert ''7''.

(6) In section 24(b), strike ''13, 14, 15, and 16'' and insert ''9, 10, 11, and 12''.

(7) In section 12(b)(1), strike ''7'' and insert in lieu thereof ''6''.

AMENDING THE CLEAN AIR ACT

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 325 just received from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 325) to amend the Clean Air Act to provide for an optional provision for the reduction of work-related vehicle trips and miles traveled in ozone nonattainment areas designated as severe, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. BAUCUS. Madam President, H.R. 325 is a short, simple bill that seeks to maintain our clean air standards while giving States greater flexibility in how they achieve them. It does this by removing the requirement that the 14 cities in 11 States with severely polluted air devise a program to reduce work-related travel by employees. But the bill reaffirms that those cities must still meet the health-based air quality standards contained in the Clean Air Act. Thus, these cities can now develop alternative methods to achieve the goal of cleaner, healthier air.

This is a narrow bill that responds to a particular problem by granting States greater flexibility while, at the same time, maintaining progress toward improving our Nation's air quality. I support both those efforts. Over the years we have learned that clean air will not be ours without careful vigilance.

There are some in Congress who would turn back the clock on our efforts to protect air quality. Those same people say we have gone overboard. That the health-based standards contained in the Clean Air Act are too difficult to achieve. That the time has come when we must relax the laws and regulations that have been responsible for improving our air quality.

Well, I disagree. And the American people disagree. The Clean Air Act has successfully delivered on its promises. Let me cite some examples.

In the 5 years since passage of the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990, over half of the cities that did not then meet the air quality standard for urban smog now meet that standard.

Over three-quarters of the cities that did not meet the air quality standard for carbon monoxide in 1990 now meet that standard.

Emissions of toxic air pollutants have been reduced by 1.6 billion pounds per year, more than six times the reductions achieved in the first 20 years under the original Clean Air Act.

Sulphur dioxide emissions, the principal cause of acid rain, have been reduced by 2.6 million tons since 1990.

And U.S. production of chemicals that deplete the stratospheric ozone layer has been reduced by over 90 percent since 1990.

Despite these successes, we cannot rest on them. Nearly two-thirds of American sampled in a poll this past summer believed that our current air pollution control laws are not strict enough.

So we must not weaken our resolve to achieve clean air. Nor can we put the special interests of some ahead of the public interest. Where we can work together to develop better, more efficient and more effective ways of achieving our environmental goals, we should. That is what this bill does, and it is why I support it. But where there are efforts to roll back our standards, to weaken the protection of human health and the environment, then we must stand firm against such changes.

Mr. SANTORUM. Madam President, I rise to support the passage of H.R. 325, which was received from the House of Representatives this afternoon. As the original Senate sponsor of this bipartisan legislation, I commend the distinguished chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee for his support and prompt assistance in obtaining unanimous consent to take up and pass this measure.

H.R. 325 repeals a costly and bureaucratic mandate, known as the Employee Trip Reduction Program [ETRP], which was imposed as part of the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990. Under the law, States are responsible for establishing the program in regions considered to be in severe nonattainment for certain air pollutants. Individual employers in these areas must develop plans to show how their employees will curb automobile use. Although this program was initially viewed as a means of encouraging ride-sharing and mass transportation in areas with severe air quality problems, it has proven very complicated and expensive to implement.

Some studies have set the cost of ETRP as high as $1,000 per employee annually, and the Environmental Protection Agency projected that it might cost employers $1.2 to $1.4 billion nationwide. When Congressional Research Service looked at this requirement, the report's authors estimated that ETRP would only reduce volatile organic compounds by 0.5 to 0.8 percent over current levels. Moreover, the failure to establish a plan and ensure employee compliance could expose businesses to fines as high as $25,000 per day.

Although I have serious questions about whether ETRP can be implemented successfully, I must stress that this legislation does not remove the trip reduction program from the Clean Air Act entirely. Instead, it replaces the law's one-size-fits-all mandate with language making this program voluntary. In crafting this legislation, it was our specific goal to leave the trip reduction program in place as a tool for States to use in meeting their overall air quality goals. In this way, it would leave States the option of electing a car-pooling program when, and where, it will have the greatest benefits.

The measure was further amended in the House Commerce Committee to make clear that states will still be responsible for achieving the pollution reductions allotted for the ETRP program, and I believe that this change will help to ensure that the environmental objectives of the Clean Air Act are not weakened.

The need for this measure is clear. In the Philadelphia metropolitan area, the looming threat of a forced car pooling program earlier this year sent hundreds of employers scrambling to establish ride-sharing programs. For some firms in the Center City area where mass transportation options are prevalent, such plans could be set up easily. Many companies in the surrounding counties or employers with irregular shifts, however, found that they could not meet the law's requirements without taking costly and extraordinary steps to restructure work schedules.

Thankfully, both the EPA and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania shelved plans for implementing the ETRP before the law was to take effect. Nevertheless, the law itself has remained in place, exposing all involved to the possibility of legal action to enforce its requirements. Twice this year, Congress has passed legislation containing a prohibition on enforcement of the ETRP. By passing H.R. 325, we will achieve a small measure of common sense regulatory relief and finally close the books on this unnecessary mandate once and for all.

Again, I thank the chairman for his support of H.R. 325, and I look forward to seeing this measure signed into law quickly.

Mr. CHAFEE. Madam President, H.R. 325 makes amendments to the Clean Air Act to fix a provision that has not worked. The 1990 Amendments required each State with a severe ozone nonattainment problem to adopt measures that would increase vehicle occupancy rates during the rush hour. Businesses and other organizations employing more than 100 people in nine major metropolitan regions were expected to encourage carpooling and the use of mass transit to reduce the number of vehicles travleing to and from work each day.

This provision of the 1990 Amendments was modeled on a program that was being implemented in Los Angeles. As more and more employers have relocated to the deep suburbs where mass transit is impractical and have built large parking facilities for their workers, metropolitan areas have experienced a dramatic increase in the number of cars on the road and the distances that commuters travel to their jobs. This increase in trips and miles traveled has, to some extent, offset dramatic gains in emissions reduction that have been achieved through catalytic converters and other pollution control devices on automobiles. The employer trip reduction program was intended to address this troublesome side of the air quality problem.

But evidence accumulated since the 1990 Amendments were enacted indicates that ridesharing programs are not a cost-effective option in the short-term to control air pollution. The effort necessary to convince commuters to get out of their cars and into carpools or buses or trains is quite expensive compared to other steps that would achieve the same emissions reductions in the short-term. It may be that over a very long period, a requirement like this would convince major employers to make locational decisions that encourage the use of transit and other ridesharing options. But in the short-run, the emissions reductions achieved do not justify the great difficulties that would be experienced by the States and by employers to carry out the trip reduction program.

This requirement of the 1990 Clean Air Act Amendments has engendered much opposition in the legislatures of the several States that are subject to. EPA made it clear earlier this year that the Agency would not aggressively enforce the requirements. And even in Los Angeles, the program that served as a model for the 1990 federal program has been discontinued. All seem to agree that this is a measure that should not be mandated.

H.R. 325 does not entirely repeal the employer trip reduction program. It makes it voluntary with the States. It will remain as potential avenue for emissions reductions for the States that choose to use it. And the bill does not rollback the Clean Air Act in any sense. All States will continue to bear an obligation to achieve healthy air quality by the same deadlines that are currently in the law. The bill makes clear that States that choose not to carry out the trip reduction program must find equivalent emissions reductions from other sources.

Madam President, we have a responsibility to act quickly to fix Federal programs, such as this one, that have proved unworkable. So, I have urged that the Senate act on this bill immediately and send it to the President without further delay. I would note that the National Highway System bill that the President recently signed corrected problems with EPA regulations for the vehicle inspection and maintenance program under the Clean Air Act. Where legitimate problems with implementation of the Clean Air Act have been discovered, we are moving to correct them.

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be deemed read a third time, passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the bill be placed at the appropriate place in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 325) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

ROOSEVELT HISTORY MONTH

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of Senate Resolution 75, a resolution proclaiming October 1996 as ''Roosevelt History Month,'' and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration, that the resolution and preamble be agreed to en bloc, and that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table, that any statements relating thereto appear in the RECORD at the appropriate place.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 75) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 75

Whereas January 30, 1995, is the 113th anniversary of the birth of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt in Hyde Park, New York;

Whereas almost a half-century after the death of President Roosevelt, his legacy remains central to the public life of the Nation;

Whereas before becoming President of the United States, Franklin Delano Roosevelt served in the New York State Senate and later was appointed Assistant Secretary of the Navy, and in 1928 became Governor of New York;

Whereas as President of the United States between 1933 and 1945, Franklin Delano Roosevelt guided the Nation through two of the greatest crises of the twentieth century, the Great Depression and the Second World War, and in so doing, changed the course of American politics;

Whereas a memorial in stone in the District of Columbia will soon be dedicated to his memory, as authorized by Congress in 1955; and

Whereas a month commemorating the history of Franklin Delano Roosevelt would complement the dedication of the memorial: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That October, 1996, should be designated ''Roosevelt History Month''. The President is requested to issue a proclamation calling on the people of the United States to observe the month with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

TITLE 18 UNIFORMITY ACT

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 242, S. 1331.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1331) to adjust and make uniform the dollar amounts used in title 18 to distinguish between grades of offenses, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Title 18 Uniformity Act of 1995''.

SEC. 2. ADJUSTING AND MAKING UNIFORM THE DOLLAR AMOUNTS USED IN TITLE 18 TO DISTINGUISH BETWEEN GRADES OF OFFENSES.

(a) Sections 215, 288, 641, 643, 644, 645, 646, 647, 648, 649, 650, 651, 652, 653, 654, 655, 656, 657, 658, 659, 661, 662, 665, 872, 1003, 1025, 1163, 1361, 1707, 1711, and 2113 of title 18, United States Code, are amended by striking ''$100'' each place it appears and inserting ''$1,000''.

(b) Section 510 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking ''$500'' and inserting ''$1,000''.

SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act and the amendments made by this Act shall apply to sentences imposed on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

Mr. BROWN. I ask unanimous consent the committee amendment be agreed to, the bill be considered read a third time and passed as amended, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, that any statements relating to the bill be placed at the appropriate place in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

So the committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING THE NEXT PANCHEN LAMA

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar 266, S. J. Res. 43.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 43) expressing the sense of the Congress regarding Wei Jingsheng; Gudhun Choekyi Nyima, the next Panchen Lama of Tibet; and the human rights practices of the Government of the People's Republic of China.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection, to the immediate consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. HELMS. Madam President, citizens all over the world are protesting—and after all major Western countries have complained to the Chinese Government—about the mistreatment of a courageous Chinese citizen named Wei Jingsheng because Wei has spent most of his life trying to bring democracy and decent human rights to his 1.2 billion fellow Chinese citizens.

In return, the Chinese Government has sentenced him to another 14 years in a jail after a trial that lasted 6 hours and to which no officials representing the United States Government were allowed to attend.

The Wei Jingsheng trial follows on the heels of last week's Communist Chinese Government's announcement that for the first time in Tibetan history, Red China has selected a successor to the Panchen Lama, the second

highest-ranking official in Tibetan Buddhism, His Holiness the Dalai Lama being the No. 1, of course.

Madam President, these significant events deserve the attention of all Americans and other citizens around the world. Senate Joint Resolution 43 is a sense-of-the-Congress resolution objecting to the treatment of Wei Jingsheng, who, by the way, is known as the father of democracy in China. Senate Joint Resolution 43 expresses regret concerning the Chinese Government's decision to name its own Panchen Lama of Tibet for the first time in Tibetan history. The resolution calls upon the United States Government to sponsor, and aggressively push for, passage of a resolution at next spring's meeting of the U.N. Human Rights Commission condemning Red China's human rights record.

In drafting this resolution, I decided that it is important to highlight both the plight of Wei Jingsheng and the Chinese Government's invasion into the religious freedoms of the Tibetan people. Both issues—religious freedom and political freedom—are human rights issues and should therefore be linked.

This is not the first linkage of these two issues. In fact, when President Clinton and Jiang Zemin met in New York, it was emphasized to the Chinese leader that it is imperative for China to make progress on these two human rights issues. In fact, at that meeting, the Chinese were requested to give special attention to the fate of Wei Jingsheng, and of other political prisoners.

Did the Chinese believe that charging Wei Jingsheng with attempting to overthrow the government and sentencing him to 14 years in jail was what was when the United States specified special attention? Of course not; the Chinese actions are mere examples of the in-your-face attitude of the Beijing government.

Madam President, Senate passage of this resolution is vital. If the Senate fails to make a clear definitive statement protesting these actions, the Chinese will decide that the American people don't care.

That, of course, is simply not the case. If the U.S. Congress does not act now on Wei Jingsheng's behalf, we will be forfeiting the opportunity to make a difference.

I further understand the Clinton administration is to decide in the near future, whether the United States should support a China human rights resolution at the next meeting of the U.N. Human Rights Commission in Geneva. We have supported a China/human rights resolution for the past 3 years.

This year should not be different. I encourage the President to think long and hard about that decision. President Clinton has said over and over that the best way to pressure the Chinese on human rights issues is to pursue them in international arenas. The U.N. Human Rights Commission is an opportunity that should not be missed.

Some Senators maintain that quiet diplomacy will work better than a congressional resolution. I differ. Since July, the United States Congress, and effectively the United States Government, have engaged in quiet diplomacy and has shied away from strong statements about events in China. Look where those efforts have gotten us on issues about which we care deeply.

That brave young man fighting for democracy in Communist China and that poor 6-year-old boy and his parents who have disappeared because he was chosen as the next Panchen Lama of Tibet need our help.

I encourage Senators to support this resolution and say a prayer for all Chinese citizens who one day could be mistreated just as these young men have been.

Mr. THOMAS. Madam President, on Monday the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee introduced Senate Joint Resolution 43 relative to two recent moves by the central government in the People's Republic of China which are of great concern to me as the chairman of the Subcommittee on East Asian and Pacific Affairs: the formal charging and trial yesterday of Chinese human rights activist Wei Jingsheng, and the selection by the central authorities in Beijing of a new Panchen Lama. I am an original cosponsor of that legislation, and rise today to express my full support for it.

Wei Jingsheng is known as the father of the PRC's modern democracy movement, and has spent a good deal of his adult life in prison as a result of his beliefs. Wei was first arrested in the spring of 1979 for allegedly ''providing foreigners with confidential military information and engaging in activities which pose a threat to state security and designed to overthrow state power;'' the fact that the ''secrets'' had been previously published in a widely-circulated government journal was apparently seen as immaterial. His true offense was participating in the ''Democracy Wall Movement'' by penning a work entitled ''Diwu Xiandaihua—The Fifth Modernization.'' That piece argued that the Communist Party's ''Four Modernizations'' program—to modernize industry, agriculture, science/technology, and the armed forces—would be incomplete without a ''fifth modernization:'' democracy. In addition, he had circulated an article warning that Deng Xiaoping was developing Mao-like dictatorial tendencies. For this, he was sentenced to a loss of political rights for 3 years and 15 years in prison of which he served 14½ years.

As part of its bid to host the 2000 Olympics, the PRC released a number of political prisoners in a quid pro quo attempt to influence the choice of the selection committee. As a result, Wei was paroled in September 1993 but was kept under constant surveillance since that time. Upon his release he resumed his prodemocracy activities, writing articles and speaking with foreign journalists and government officials in support of democracy in China.

On April 1, 1994, just a few weeks after he had met with Assistant Secretary of State John Shattuck to discuss human rights in the PRC, Wei vanished. While it was known at the time that he had been arrested, no warrant had been issued for his arrest; no formal charges were instituted against him; members of his family were never notified of his arrest or subsequent whereabouts, and the authorities would not even confirm he was being held. Inquires as to his status from organizations and leaders outside of China were rebuffed.

On November 21, of this year, 20 months after first being arrested and held without charge, the Xinhua News Agency announced that Wei was being formally charged with ''activities to overthrow the government.'' Although the exact nature of his ''crimes'' was left nebulous, the charge carries the death penalty in the PRC. The PRC, which seems to have learned a thing or two about public relations over the years, conveniently timed the announcement to occur after the completion of the recent APEC meetings in Osaka, Japan, and after the announcement of the 1995 Nobel Peace Prize for which Wei had been nominated; both events would have provided an uncomfortable forum for international criticism of the charges. Instead, they have until the next meeting of the U.N. Human Rights Commission in Geneva next March to try and convict Wei and the hope that any international uproar will die down.

A Xinhua report this last Sunday noted that Wei's trial would begin today (late yesterday, Beijing time) in the Beijing Intermediate People's Court. As of 48 hours before the trial was scheduled to begin, Wei's attorney—Zhang Sishi—had still not received written notice of the charges against his client, nor had he been allowed to meet with him. Although it has been announced that the trial will be—somewhat uncharacteristically—''open,'' that means only that some of Wei's family members may be allowed to attend along with other individuals picked by the government. Late yesterday, after a 6-hour trial, Wei was sentenced to a 14 year term of imprisonment.

I am deeply concerned with the use of the Chinese criminal code to silence those who peacefully advocate democratization and who exercise their rights to free speech. I am equally worried by the response, or should I say lack of response, from the Clinton administration. Candidate Clinton was long on talk about Republicans ''coddling dictators,'' and how he would make human rights the foundation of his foreign policy. But as we have seen with so many other issues, he apparently did not mean what he said; as far as I can tell, that foundation is cracked. The Clinton administration has been slowly ceding ground on this issue with the Chinese since he took office. Instead of high-level reactions to

the Wei arrest and trial, I have seen only low-level, lukewarm, noncommittal expressions of concern from Foggy Bottom.

In 1986, in a speech urging his fellow party leaders to take a hard-line on domestic critics of the government, Deng Xiaoping used Wei as an example:

Didn't we arrest Wei Jingsheng? We arrested him and have not let him go, yet China's image has not suffered.

Whether Wei's predicament is to be a bargaining tool for the March U.N. meeting, or signals a shift towards the conservatives in the party hierarchy, President Clinton's lack of response at this time can only embolden China, and place at risk the freedom of others in the democracy movement such as student leader Wang Dan, activist Li Guotao, trade unionist Liu Nianchun, academician Yuan Hongbing and religious activist Xiao Biguang. All have disappeared in the last 2 years.

Turning to the issue of the Panchen Lama, it is a central belief in Tibetan Buddhism that certain deities take human form in the bodies of important lamas to lead believers toward enlightenment. It is believed that the souls of these lamas are reborn shortly after their deaths into the bodies of newborn infants in order to continue their task on earth. Known generically as tulku, the two most important of these lamas are the Dalai Lama, the temporal and spiritual head of Tibet, and the Panchen Lama. The Panchen Lama is believed to be a reincarnation of the Buddha Amitabha, the Buddha of Infinite Light. Because he wields the highest temporal as well as spiritual authority, the Dalai Lama is considered preeminent to the Panchen in the lamaist hierarchy.

Since the occupation of Tibet beginning in the late 1940's, the Chinese have sought to coopt the Panchen Lama in an attempt to counter the role and authority of the Dalai Lama. When the Chinese invaded Tibet and overthrew the legitimate government, the Dalai Lama fled to northern India where he established a Tibetan government-in-exile. The 10th Panchen Lama remained behind however, effectively becoming over the years the Vidkun Quisling of Tibet, assisting the Chinese in the ''peaceful liberation'' of Tibet. As reported in the November 11 edition of Xzang Ribao:

In March 1959, Tibet's upper-level reactionary clique launched a counter-revolutionary armed revolt in a vain attempt to undermine the motherland's unification. Great Master Panchen [the Panchen Lama] immediately cabled Chairman Mao and Premier Zhou [Enlai] to express his support for the State Council's order to dissolve the Tibetan local government and to quell the rebellion. At a rally held by people of all circles of Xigaze [Shigatse], he urged all monks, ordinary people, and patriotic people of Tibet to clearly distinguish right from wrong and good from evil, to draw a clear line between them and the reactionary clique, and, under the party's leadership, to unite in resolutely assisting the People's Liberation Army to quell the rebellion. Since September 1987, a small number of separatist elements have created disturbances and made troubles in Lhasa, but the Great Master Panchen always maintained a firm stand, held high the banner of patriotism, and unequivocally and resolutely upheld the motherland's unification and national unity.

He became a member of the Chinese-installed Communist government, and regularly called on Tibetans to submit to the new order. In frequent statements he praised the new Communist government, and over the years gave legitimacy to the Chinese occupation. Although he apparently had a change of heart at the beginning of the Cultural Revolution, for which he was jailed for nearly a decade, after his rehabilitation in 1978 he continued to refuse to back calls for Tibetan independence.

Since the death of the Panchen Lama in January 1989, observers have expected a clash between the Tibetans and the Chinese over the choice of the lama's reincarnation. The reason is simple: this conflict is not simply some arcane religious tussle, but is part of the ongoing collision of interests over who really rules Tibet. For the first time, the Chinese were presented with the opportunity of hand-picking and shaping in their own political image from his youth a traditional leader of the Tibetan people. With the prospect of grooming a credible and more compliant alternative leader for the Tibetan people, few believed that the Chinese would acquiesce to the rightful authority of the Dalai Lama and Tibetan Buddhist hierarchy in the choice.

Soon after the Panchen's death, negotiations took place between the central government and the group charged with searching for his reincarnation, the monks of Tashilhunpo—''Mass of Glory''—Monastery in Shigatse, the traditional seat of the Panchen Lama. The compromise reached provided that the monks would look for the reincarnate lama only in China and Tibet, thus precluding a candidate being found among the Dalai Lama's Tibetan supporters in exile in India. In return, the monks were promised that they could use traditional procedures to select the reborn lama.

A committee of monks from the Tashilhunpo began to search for the reincarnate lama by consulting religious oracles and searching for omens in the reflective waters of a lake high in the Himalayas. The committee then visited children in villages around the country who were reported to have certain physical and mental indications of being reincarnate. The committee spent more than 5 years examining various candidates. As they finalized their choice, to the chagrin of the authorities in Beijing word was leaked from the search committee to the Dalai Lama of the identity of the candidates. This allowed the Dalai Lama, who the Chinese for the first time had excluded from his traditional role in the process, to act preemptively and announce on May 14 that the search committee had found the reincarnation of the Panchen Lama in the person of 6-year-old Gedhum Chökyi Nyima in the Tibetan village of Nagchu, Lhari District, north of Lhasa.

Their loss of control over the process infuriated the Chinese, who denounced the proclamation in predictably Communist rhetoric. The government press labelled the Dalai Lama's action ''splittist'' and ''illegal and invalid,'' and condemned him for ''his vicious intention of disrupting Tibet's stability and undermining China's national unity through religious means.''

Having been beaten to the punch by the Dalai Lama, the Chinese government attempted to regain the initiative. The Dalai Lama's candidate disappeared, and is said by authoritative sources to be held under house arrest in Beijing with his parents. Moreover, the Chinese launched an unprecedented media campaign to discredit the Dalai Lama and his choice, and to justify their brazen interference in the selection process. The complete irony of a secular atheist Communist government completely usurping such a purely religious issue as the choice of a reincarnated soul should be lost on no one. The Chinese have spent years attempting to destroy Tibetan Buddhism as a remnant of the ''feudal, oppressive past,'' and as a competitor to Communism; it is, after all, a central tenant of Marxist-Leninist thought that religion is the opiate of the masses. Thousands of Buddhist monks and nuns have been arrested and imprisoned since the annexation of Tibet; thousands of monasteries and temples have been destroyed, and countless works of religious devotion such as statues have been melted down or shipped out of the country. Yet the government in Beijing has devoted a significant amount of press and other resources to the reincarnation question. The cover and many of the articles in a recent issue of the Beijing Review were devoted to it; countless articles have appeared in official party newspapers such as Rénmín Ríbáo. For example, for over a week the front page of the party daily in Tibet, Xźáng Ríbáo, carried a lengthy and detailed series called ''Questions and Answers Regarding the Reincarnated Child of the 10th Panchen.''

The attacks have extended to the Dalai Lama himself. For example, a four-part series on Lhasa Tibet People's Radio Network broadcast over a period of 4 days vilified His Holiness and exposed his so-called ''crimes.'' He has suffered similar attacks from Gyatsen Norbu, the Chairman of the Tibet Autonomous Regional People's Government, the Communist-controlled Executive Council of the Buddhist Association of China, and Pagbalha Geleg Namgyai, Chairman of the Tibet Autonomous Region Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference. The official media have also done everything to slander and tarnish the Dalai Lama's choice for Panchen, including accusing the boy's parents of having bad reputations among their

neighbors, and the boy of killing a dog by drowning it—an thoroughly un-Buddhist act.

The amount of coverage the issue has received in the communist media has reached the point of overkill, even for the Chinese press, and has risen to the level that it indicates that the government in Beijing believes that if they repeat something enough it will eventually become the truth. I am reminded of the line from Act III of Shakespeare's ''Hamlet'', which I paraphrase: ''The government doth protest too much, methinks.''

Coincident with the increase of official propaganda, the Chinese continued to try to regain control of the process. In September the Chinese ousted Chadrel Rinpoche—the head abbot of the Tashilhunpo Monastery and head of the search committee—and replaced him with their own candidate, Sengchen Lobsang Gyatsen. Chadrel Rinpoche is believed to be in detention with several other noncompliant monks from the monastery. Three new names for finalists —Gyaltsen Norbu of Nagchu, Tsering Wangdu of Nagchu, and Ngawang Namdrol of Lhasa—were then identified by the Chinese government, which announced that the finalist would be chosen by drawing lots from a golden urn, a procedure used once in 1792 by a Qing dynasty emperor. Chinese television showed State President Jiang Zemin meeting with the monks remaining on the committee, urging them to complete their work as soon as possible in order to ''ensure stable development in Tibet.''

On November 6, the Chinese government convened a meeting of senior lamas at the Jingxi Guest House in Beijing to finalize the selection process. On November 10, Li Ruihuan, a member of the Standing Committee of the Central Political Bureau and Chairman of the National Committee of the Chinese People's Consultative Conference, addressed the meeting and gave it its marching orders. At the end of November, the Chinese chose 6-year-old Gyaltsen Norbu as the 11th Panchen Lama; he was enthroned in Lhasa on December 8. In its haste to put the official imprimatur on the child, the Chinese brushed aside the several years of monastic training usually afforded a candidate before his enthronement. Senior monks were required to attend the ceremony at Lhasa's Jokhang Cathedral, and those supportive of the Dalai Lama and feigning illness in order to avoid attendance were warned on the consequences of such action. State Councilor Li Tieying oversaw the ceremony, delivering a message from Jiang Zemin for the boy to ''safeguard the motherland and work in the interests of the people.'' In reply, the boy reportedly responded by ''express[ing] his gratitude to the central government, President Jiang Zemin, Premier Li Peng, and representatives of the State Council * * * and saying that he loves the motherland [China] and the Tibetan religion.''

The blatant interference in a purely religious Tibetan affair is of great concern. Without getting bogged down in a detailed and somewhat esoteric discussion of the historical precedents, let me just outline some of the objections to the Chinese position. First, it completely ignores the Dalai Lama's centuries-old right to participate actively in the choice of the Panchen Lama. By eschewing the Dalai Lama's traditional role, the Chinese are completely flouting the historical precedent they claim they are upholding. The confirmation of either the Dalai or Panchen Lama is not complete until mutually recognized by the other. Chinese scholars, whom the government is so fond of quoting, have previously reiterated this requirement. For example, Ya Hanzhang, in his Biographies of the Tibetan Leaders Panchen Erdeni, wrote:

> By Tibetan tradition a reincarnation of the Panchen could not be religiously legal without the Dalai's recognition, and the same was the case with the Dalai.

Thus, the exclusion of the Dalai Lama renders the validity of Beijing's choice void ab initio.

Second, for the first time in history it puts the Chinese government in the place of the Dalai Lama. In the past, Beijing's role was one limited to nominal approval of the selection already made by the Tibetans. There existed a unique relationship between the high lamas of Tibet and the Chinese imperial court; it was called ''priest-patron.'' The Chinese emperors looked to the lamas as spiritual advisers. In return for that advice, the Chinese offered gifts to the high lamas and military protection to the region. Therefore, any involvement by the Chinese in the choice of a Dalai or Panchen Lama during the Qing dynasty, under Emperors such as Kangxi and Qianlong, stemmed not from a desire to dictate the outcome from Beijing but because those Emperors were fervent followers of Tibetan Buddhism.

Mr. President, I can already predict with certainty the Chinese reaction to this joint resolution. The Foreign Ministry is sure to declare both issues solely within the purview of China's internal affairs which are, ipso facto, none of the rest of the world's business. In fact, in response to world criticism of the Wei arrest Shen Guofang, the Ministry spokesperson, has already stated:

> The case of Wei Jingsheng is not a human rights affair. On the contrary, it is those people and organizations who try to interfere in China's judicial procedures that have actually violated international standards by interfering in China's internal affairs.

Rather than rehash this old human rights/internal affairs song and dance, then, let me take a new approach an give the PRC another reason why these issues are important to us and should, consequently, be important to them. The Chinese have made a great deal of noise lately about being allowed to assume their rightful place among important powers on the world stage, and have complained vociferously that the West is unfairly trying to prevent them from that place.

I and several of my colleagues have tried to make it clear to Beijing that there is not some organized plot attempting to keep them from doing so. Rather, what we have emphasized to them is that a place at that particular table is not a right free for the taking, but a privilege which comes with it a panoply of responsibilities. Foremost among those is to adhere to international norms of conduct and to treaty and similar legal commitments.

If the PRC does not live up to its present commitments, then they can be sure that the rest of the world is going to be hesitant to enter into any others with it; and the problem is, they are not. Beijing says that it is fully living up to all its obligations. However, as the Chinese are fond of saying, words are fine but only if followed up by deeds. An examination of their deeds, unfortunately, shows that these do not match their words. In the case of Wei Jingsheng, the maximum amount of time a criminal suspect can be detained without charge is twelve months; yet he was held for over twenty. China is a signatory to the universal Declaration of Human Rights, yet the handling of Wei's case clearly violates Article III of that document. Finally, the language of the Xinhua announcement of the charges against Wei noted that his actions ''were in violation of the criminal law and constituted crimes;'' an article in the December 11 Beijing Review notes that his actions leading to this arrest ''[were] in violation of the Criminal Law and constitute crimes.'' This, and the fact that his trial took only 6 hours, seems to me to indicate that his guilt had been determined long before his trial began. This presupposition of guilt also runs counter in international standards of justice.

As for the Panchen issue, the PRC's constitution guarantees freedom of religion and freedom from being discriminated against on the basis of religious belief. Yet thousands of Tibetans have been persecuted for their religious faith over the years. Moreover, Beijing's manipulation of the selection of the Panchen Lama is clear meddling in a purely religious issue for political gain, and violates the religious rights of believing Tibetans. Similarly, as Senator FEINSTEIN mentioned yesterday in a meeting of the full Foreign Relations Committee, she has been repeatedly assured over the years by officials in the highest levels of the Chinese Government that Tibet ''is entitled to manage its own cultural and religious affairs.'' The actions regarding the Panchen Lama would seem to contradict that assertion.

Time and time again China calls into question its commitment to the rule of law and to international norms, whether it be in regards to agreements on intellectual property, the enforcement of international arbitration awards, or the proliferation of nuclear or other

weapons. The cases of Wei Jingsheng and the Panchen Lama are just two more unfortunate examples. If as a result the rest of the world is a bit reticent to enter into other agreements with the PRC—for example, the WTO agreement—for fear that the Chinese will continue to say one thing but do another, then before it points the finger of accusation at us for denying it its ''rightful place'' in the world, it should realize that it has no one to blame but itself.

I urge my colleagues to support Senate Joint Resolution 43, and thank the distinguished Chairman and ranking member of the Committee for their leadership on these important issues.

Mr. BROWN. I ask unanimous consent the joint resolution be deemed read a third time, passed, the amendment to the preamble be agreed to, the preamble as amended be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that the statements relating to the resolution be placed at the appropriate place in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 43) was deemed read the third time and passed.

The preamble, as amended, was agreed to.

The joint resolution, with its preamble, is as follows:

S.J. RES. 43

Whereas on November 21, 1995, the Government of the People's Republic of China formally arrested Wei Jingsheng, who is known internationally as the father of the democracy movement in China;

Whereas the Government of the People's Republic of China has held Wei Jingsheng incommunicado and without charge since April 1994 and has rebuffed international calls to release him;

Whereas Wei Jingsheng has spent all but 6 months of the last 16 years in detention because of this unwavering support for freedom of speech and the development of democracy in China;

Whereas at an October 1995 meeting in New York between President Clinton and President Jiang Zemin of China, the Administration urged the Government of the People's Republic of China to release political prisoners and specifically included Wei Jingsheng and others among such prisoners;

Whereas the treatment of Wei Jingsheng by the Government of the People's Republic of China raises concern over the future of other jailed dissidents in China, including Wang Dan, a student leader in the 1989 prodemocracy movement in China;

Whereas on May 14, 1995, His Holiness the Dalai Lama announced recognition of 6-year-old Gedhun Choekyi Nyima as the next Panchen Lama;

Whereas recognition of the successor to the Panchen Lama in Tibet has always been within the authority of the Dalai Lama;

Whereas for the first time in Tibetan history, the Government of the People's Republic of China has imposed on Tibet its own candidate for a new Panchen Lama and has rejected the new Panchen Lama selected by the Dalai Lama;

Whereas Gedhun Choekyi Nyima and his family have been missing for 6 months and are reported being held by authorities of the Government of the People's Republic of China;

Whereas Chatrel Rinpoche, who is the head of the original search committee for the new Panchen Lama and who refused to denounce the Dalai Lama's selection of the new Panchen Lama, is also missing and believed to be held by authorities of the Government of the People's Republic of China;

Whereas the Panchen Lama is one of the highest-ranking religious official of Tibetan Buddhism;

Whereas the rejection of the Dalai Lama's selection of Panchen Lama by the Government of the People's Republic of China, and the selection of its own candidate for Panchen Lama, is seen by many Tibetans as politicizing a purely religious affair and as a violation of fundamental Tibetan human rights;

Whereas since the invasion of Tibet in 1949, the Government of the People's Republic of China has taken any expression by the Tibetan people of their distinct religious or cultural identity as a direct challenge to that government's political control of Tibet;

Whereas Chinese officials have repeatedly maintained that the Tibet Autonomous Region is entitled to manage its own cultural and religious affairs, and the intervention of Chinese government authorities in the selection of the next Panchen Lama is a clear violation of that principle;

Whereas for 3 consecutive years, the United States has been a primary sponsor of resolutions criticizing the human rights practices of the Government of the People's Republic of China in China and Tibet at the annual meetings of the United Nations Human Rights Commission in Geneva;

Whereas these resolutions call upon the Government of the People's Republic of China to take measures to ensure the observance of all human rights, invite that government to cooperate with all special rapporteurs and working groups, and request the Secretary General of the United Nations to prepare a report for the United Nations Human Rights Commission on the human rights situation in China and Tibet;

Whereas at the March 1995 meeting of the United Nations Human Rights Commission in Geneva, the resolution lost by only 1 vote;

Whereas it is important to maintain international pressure on the Government of the People's Republic of China in order to induce that government to respect internationally-recognized standards of human rights; and

Whereas in May 1994, the President of the United States pledged strong support for efforts at international forums to criticize the human rights practices of the Government of the People's Republic of China: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the United States Government should—

(1) press for the immediate and unconditional release of Wei Jingsheng and other political prisoners by the Government of the People's Republic of China;

(2) urge the Government of the People's Republic of China to respect the wishes of the Tibetan people by supporting the selection of the new Panchen Lama by His Holiness the Dalai Lama;

(3) work to ensure the safety of the new Panchen Lama as selected by the Dalai Lama; and

(4) sponsor and aggressively push for the passage of a resolution regarding the human rights situation in China at the annual meeting of the United Nations Human Rights Commission in Geneva scheduled for March 1996.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

MEASURE READ FOR THE FIRST TIME—S. 1472

Mr. FORD. Madam President, I understand that S. 1472, Federal Judges for the Middle and Eastern Districts of Louisiana, introduced earlier today by Senator BREAUX, is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. FORD. Madam President, I ask for the first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1472) to provide for one additional Federal judge for the Middle and Eastern Districts of Louisiana and one less Federal Judge for the Eastern District of Louisiana.

Mr. FORD. Madam President, I ask for the second reading.

Mr. BROWN. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The bill will lay over and will receive its second reading on the next legislative day.

AU PAIR PROGRAMS EXTENSION

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 267, S. 1465.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1465) to extend au pair programs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 3099

(Purpose: To extend au pair programs through fiscal year 1997)

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I send an amendment to the desk for Senator HELMS and Senator DODD, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Colorado (Mr. BROWN), for Mr. HELMS, for himself and Mr. DODD, proposes an amendment numbered 3099.

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

On line 9, strike ''1999'' and replace with ''1997.''

On page 2, line 1, strike ''1998'' and replace with ''1996''.

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be agreed to, that the bill be deemed read a third time, passed, as amended, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the bill be placed at the appropriate place in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 3099) was agreed to.

So the bill (S. 1465), as amended, was deemed read for the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1465

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF AU PAIR PROGRAMS.

(a) REPEAL.—Section 8 of the Eisenhower Exchange Fellowship Act of 1990 (Public Law 101–454) is repealed.

(b) AUTHORITY FOR AU PAIR PROGRAMS.—The Director of the United States Information Agency is authorized to continue to administer an au pair program, operating on a world-wide basis, through fiscal year 1997.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than October 1, 1996, the Director of the United States Information Agency shall submit a report regarding the continued extension of au pair programs to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives. This report shall specifically detail the compliance of all au pair organizations with regulations governing au pair programs as published on February 15, 1995.

ANTICOUNTERFEITING CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 250, S. 1136.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1136) to control and prevent commercial counterfeiting, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill. which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments; as follows:

(The parts of the bill intended to be stricken are shown in boldface brackets and the part of the bill intended to be inserted are shown in italic.)

S. 1136

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Anticounterfeiting Consumer Protection Act of 1995''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The counterfeiting of trademarked and copyrighted merchandise—

(1) has been connected with organized crime;

(2) deprives legitimate trademark and copyright owners of substantial revenues and consumer goodwill;

(3) poses health and safety threats to American consumers;

(4) eliminates American jobs; and

(5) is a multibillion-dollar drain on the United States economy.

SEC. 3. COUNTERFEITING AS RACKETEERING.

Section 1961(1)(B) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting '', section 2318 (relating to trafficking in counterfeit labels for phonorecords, computer programs or computer program documentation or packaging and copies of motion pictures or other audiovisual works), section 2319 (relating to criminal infringement of a copyright), section 2320 (relating to trafficking in goods or services bearing counterfeit marks)'' after ''sections 2314 and 2315 (relating to interstate transportation of stolen property)''.

SEC. 4. APPLICATION TO COMPUTER PROGRAMS, COMPUTER PROGRAM DOCUMENTATION, OR PACKAGING.

Section 2318 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting ''a computer program or computer program documentation or packaging or'' after ''copy of'';

(2) in subsection (b)(3), by inserting '''computer program,''' after '''motion picture,''''; and

(3) in subsection (c)(3), by inserting ''a copy of a computer program or computer program documentation or packaging,'' after ''enclose,''.

SEC. 5. TRAFFICKING IN COUNTERFEIT GOODS OR SERVICES.

Section 2320 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(e) Beginning with the first year after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Attorney General shall include in the report of the Attorney General to Congress on the business of the Department of Justice prepared pursuant to section 522 of title 28, on a district by district basis, for all actions involving trafficking in counterfeit labels for phonorecords, copies of computer programs or computer program documentation or packaging, copies of motion pictures or other audiovisual works (as defined in section 2318 of title 18), criminal infringement of copyrights (as defined in section 2319 of title 18), or trafficking in goods or services bearing counterfeit marks (as defined in section 2320 of title 18, an accounting of—

''(1) the number of open investigations;

''(2) the number of cases referred by the United States Customs Service;

''(3) the number of cases referred by other agencies or sources; and

''(4) the number and outcome, including settlements, sentences, recoveries, and penalties, of all prosecutions brought under sections 2318, 2319, and 2320 of title 18.''.

SEC. 6. SEIZURE OF COUNTERFEIT GOODS.

Section 34(d)(9) of the Act of July 5, 1946 (60 Stat. 427, chapter 540; 15 U.S.C. 1116(d)(9)), is amended by striking the first sentence and inserting the following: ''The court shall order that service of a copy of the order under this subsection shall be made by a Federal law enforcement officer (such as a United States marshal or an officer or agent of the United States Customs Service, Secret Service, Federal Bureau of Investigation, or Post Office) or may be made by a State or local law enforcement officer, who, upon making service, shall carry out the seizure under the order.''.

SEC. 7. RECOVERY FOR VIOLATION OF RIGHTS.

Section 35 of the Act of July 5, 1946 (60 Stat. 427, chapter 540; 15 U.S.C. 1117), is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(c) In a case involving the use of a counterfeit mark (as defined in section 34(d) (15 U.S.C. 1116(d)) in connection with the sale, offering for sale, or distribution of goods or services, the plaintiff may elect, at any time before final judgment is rendered by the trial court, to recover, instead of actual damages and profits under subsection (a), an award of statutory damages for any such use in the amount of—

''(1) not less than $500 or more than $100,000 per counterfeit mark per type of goods or services sold, offered for sale, or distributed, as the court considers just; or

''(2) if the court finds that the use of the counterfeit mark was willful, not more than $1,000,000 per counterfeit mark per type of goods or services sold, offered for sale, or distributed, as the court considers just.''.

SEC. 8. DISPOSITION OF EXCLUDED ARTICLES.

Section 603(c) of title 17, United States Code, is amended in the second sentence by striking ''as the case may be;'' and all that follows through the end and inserting ''as the case may be.''.

SEC. 9. DISPOSITION OF MERCHANDISE BEARING AMERICAN TRADEMARK.

Section 526(e) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1526(e)) is amended—

(1) in the second sentence, by inserting ''destroy the merchandise. Alternatively, if the merchandise is not unsafe or a hazard to health, and the Secretary has the consent of the trademark owner, the Secretary may'' after ''shall, after forfeiture,'';

(2) by inserting ''or'' at the end of paragraph (2);

(3) by striking '', or'' at the end of paragraph (3) and inserting a period; and

(4) by striking paragraph (4).

SEC. 10. CIVIL PENALTIES.

Section 526 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1526) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(f)(1) Any person who directs, assists financially or otherwise, or **[**is in any way concerned in**]** *aids and abets* the importation of merchandise for sale or public distribution that is seized under subsection (e) shall be subject to a civil fine.

''(2) For the first such seizure, the fine shall be **[**equal to**]** *not more than* the value that the merchandise would have had if it were genuine, according to the manufacturer's suggested retail price, determined under regulations promulgated by the Secretary.

''(3) For the second seizure and thereafter, the fine shall be **[**equal to**]** *not more than* twice the value that the merchandise would have had if it were genuine, as determined under regulations promulgated by the Secretary.

''(4) The imposition of a fine under this subsection shall be within the discretion of the United States Customs Service, and shall be in addition to any other civil or criminal penalty or other remedy authorized by law.''.

SEC. 11. PUBLIC DISCLOSURE OF AIRCRAFT MANIFESTS.

Section 431(c)(1) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1431(c)(1)) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting ''vessel or aircraft'' before ''manifest'';

(2) by amending subparagraph (D) to read as follows:

''(D) The name of the vessel, aircraft, or carrier.'';

(3) by amending subparagraph (E) to read as follows:

''(E) The seaport or airport of loading.''; and

(4) by amending subparagraph (F) to read as follows:

''(F) The seaport or airport of discharge.''.

SEC. 12. CUSTOMS ENTRY DOCUMENTATION.

Section 484(d) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1484(d)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''Entries'' and inserting ''(1) Entries''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(2) The Secretary, in prescribing regulations governing the content of entry documentation, shall require that entry documentation contain such information as may be necessary to determine whether the imported merchandise bears an infringing trademark in violation of section 42 of the

Act of July 5, 1946 (60 Stat. 440, chapter 540; 15 U.S.C. 1124) or any other applicable law, including a trademark appearing on the goods or packaging.''.

SEC. 13. UNLAWFUL USE OF VESSELS, VEHICLES, AND AIRCRAFT IN AID OF COMMERCIAL COUNTERFEITING.

Section 80302(a) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking ''or'' at the end of paragraph (4);

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (5) and inserting ''; or''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(6)(A) A counterfeit label for a phonorecord, computer program or computer program documentation or packaging or copy of a motion picture or other audiovisual work (as defined in section 2318 of title 18);

''(B) a phonorecord or copy in violation of section 2319 of title 18; or

''(C) any good bearing a counterfeit mark (as defined in section 2320 of title 18).''.

SEC. 14. REGULATIONS.

Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe such regulations or amendments to existing regulations that may be necessary to implement and enforce this Act.

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to, the bill be deemed read a third time, passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the bill be placed at the appropriate place in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

So the committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill (S. 1136), as amended, was deemed read for the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1136

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Anticounterfeiting Consumer Protection Act of 1995''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The counterfeiting of trademarked and copyrighted merchandise—

(1) has been connected with organized crime;

(2) deprives legitimate trademark and copyright owners of substantial revenues and consumer goodwill;

(3) poses health and safety threats to American consumers;

(4) eliminates American jobs; and

(5) is a multibillion-dollar drain on the United States economy.

SEC. 3. COUNTERFEITING AS RACKETEERING.

Section 1961(1)(B) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting '', section 2318 (relating to trafficking in counterfeit labels for phonorecords, computer programs or computer program documentation or packaging and copies of motion pictures or other audiovisual works), section 2319 (relating to criminal infringement of a copyright), section 2320 (relating to trafficking in goods or services bearing counterfeit marks)'' after ''sections 2314 and 2315 (relating to interstate transportation of stolen property)''.

SEC. 4. APPLICATION TO COMPUTER PROGRAMS, COMPUTER PROGRAM DOCUMENTATION, OR PACKAGING.

Section 2318 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting ''a computer program or computer program documentation or packaging or'' after ''copy of'';

(2) in subsection (b)(3), by inserting '''computer program,''' after '''motion picture,''''; and

(3) in subsection (c)(3), by inserting ''a copy of a computer program or computer program documentation or packaging,'' after ''enclose,''.

SEC. 5. TRAFFICKING IN COUNTERFEIT GOODS OR SERVICES.

Section 2320 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(e) Beginning with the first year after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Attorney General shall include in the report of the Attorney General to Congress on the business of the Department of Justice prepared pursuant to section 522 of title 28, on a district by district basis, for all actions involving trafficking in counterfeit labels for phonorecords, copies of computer programs or computer program documentation or packaging, copies of motion pictures or other audiovisual works (as defined in section 2318 of title 18), criminal infringement of copyrights (as defined in section 2319 of title 18), or trafficking in goods or services bearing counterfeit marks (as defined in section 2320 of title 18, an accounting of—

''(1) the number of open investigations;

''(2) the number of cases referred by the United States Customs Service;

''(3) the number of cases referred by other agencies or sources; and

''(4) the number and outcome, including settlements, sentences, recoveries, and penalties, of all prosecutions brought under sections 2318, 2319, and 2320 of title 18.''.

SEC. 6. SEIZURE OF COUNTERFEIT GOODS.

Section 34(d)(9) of the Act of July 5, 1946 (60 Stat. 427, chapter 540; 15 U.S.C. 1116(d)(9)), is amended by striking the first sentence and inserting the following: ''The court shall order that service of a copy of the order under this subsection shall be made by a Federal law enforcement officer (such as a United States marshal or an officer or agent of the United States Customs Service, Secret Service, Federal Bureau of Investigation, or Post Office) or may be made by a State or local law enforcement officer, who, upon making service, shall carry out the seizure under the order.''.

SEC. 7. RECOVERY FOR VIOLATION OF RIGHTS.

Section 35 of the Act of July 5, 1946 (60 Stat. 427, chapter 540; 15 U.S.C. 1117), is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(c) In a case involving the use of a counterfeit mark (as defined in section 34(d) (15 U.S.C. 1116(d)) in connection with the sale, offering for sale, or distribution of goods or services, the plaintiff may elect, at any time before final judgment is rendered by the trial court, to recover, instead of actual damages and profits under subsection (a), an award of statutory damages for any such use in the amount of—

''(1) not less than $500 or more than $100,000 per counterfeit mark per type of goods or services sold, offered for sale, or distributed, as the court considers just; or

''(2) if the court finds that the use of the counterfeit mark was willful, not more than $1,000,000 per counterfeit mark per type of goods or services sold, offered for sale, or distributed, as the court considers just.''.

SEC. 8. DISPOSITION OF EXCLUDED ARTICLES.

Section 603(c) of title 17, United States Code, is amended in the second sentence by striking ''as the case may be;'' and all that follows through the end and inserting ''as the case may be.''.

SEC. 9. DISPOSITION OF MERCHANDISE BEARING AMERICAN TRADEMARK.

Section 526(e) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1526(e)) is amended—

(1) in the second sentence, by inserting ''destroy the merchandise. Alternatively, if the merchandise is not unsafe or a hazard to health, and the Secretary has the consent of the trademark owner, the Secretary may'' after ''shall, after forfeiture,'';

(2) by inserting ''or'' at the end of paragraph (2);

(3) by striking '', or'' at the end of paragraph (3) and inserting a period; and

(4) by striking paragraph (4).

SEC. 10. CIVIL PENALTIES.

Section 526 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1526) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(f)(1) Any person who directs, assists financially or otherwise, or aids and abets the importation of merchandise for sale or public distribution that is seized under subsection (e) shall be subject to a civil fine.

''(2) For the first such seizure, the fine shall be not more than the value that the merchandise would have had if it were genuine, according to the manufacturer's suggested retail price, determined under regulations promulgated by the Secretary.

''(3) For the second seizure and thereafter, the fine shall be not more than twice the value that the merchandise would have had if it were genuine, as determined under regulations promulgated by the Secretary.

''(4) The imposition of a fine under this subsection shall be within the discretion of the United States Customs Service, and shall be in addition to any other civil or criminal penalty or other remedy authorized by law.''.

SEC. 11. PUBLIC DISCLOSURE OF AIRCRAFT MANIFESTS.

Section 431(c)(1) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1431(c)(1)) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting ''vessel or aircraft'' before ''manifest'';

(2) by amending subparagraph (D) to read as follows:

''(D) The name of the vessel, aircraft, or carrier.'';

(3) by amending subparagraph (E) to read as follows:

''(E) The seaport or airport of loading.''; and

(4) by amending subparagraph (F) to read as follows:

''(F) The seaport or airport of discharge.''.

SEC. 12. CUSTOMS ENTRY DOCUMENTATION.

Section 484(d) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1484(d)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''Entries'' and inserting ''(1) Entries''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(2) The Secretary, in prescribing regulations governing the content of entry documentation, shall require that entry documentation contain such information as may be necessary to determine whether the imported merchandise bears an infringing trademark in violation of section 42 of the Act of July 5, 1946 (60 Stat. 440, chapter 540; 15 U.S.C. 1124) or any other applicable law, including a trademark appearing on the goods or packaging.''.

SEC. 13. UNLAWFUL USE OF VESSELS, VEHICLES, AND AIRCRAFT IN AID OF COMMERCIAL COUNTERFEITING.

Section 80302(a) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking ''or'' at the end of paragraph (4);

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (5) and inserting ''; or''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(6)(A) A counterfeit label for a phonorecord, computer program or computer program documentation or packaging or copy of a motion picture or other audiovisual work (as defined in section 2318 of title 18);

''(B) a phonorecord or copy in violation of section 2319 of title 18; or

''(C) any good bearing a counterfeit mark (as defined in section 2320 of title 18).''.

SEC. 14. REGULATIONS.

Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe such regulations or amendments to existing regulations that may be necessary to implement and enforce this Act.

Mr. BROWN. The distinguished Senator from Kentucky has been so cooperative, I wonder if he might agree to the balanced budget by unanimous consent at this time.

Mr. FORD. Madam President, there is always euphoria at times around here, and we usually have to put the needle into the balloon, and I will just do that now. [Laughter.]

Mr. BROWN. I had hoped the Senator, for the sake of the Christmas spirit, might be willing to go along.

Mr. FORD. The Senator from Kentucky has a lot of spirit, Senator.

Mr. BROWN. I know. But you charge for that.

Mr. FORD. That is right—for you, double. [Laughter.]

Mr. BROWN. We will want to assure the Senator that we will give him another chance.

Mr. FORD. I always look forward to another chance. At 72, I have had second chances for a long time.

Wednesday, December 13, 1995

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate agreed to Bosnia Deployment resolution.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S18449–S18582

Measures Introduced: Six bills and three resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 1472–1477, S.J. Res. 44, and S. Con. Res. 35 and 36. **Page S18559**

Measures Reported: Reports were made as follows:

Special Report on Revised Allocation to Subcommittees of Budget Totals from the Concurrent Resolution for the fiscal year 1996. (S. Rept. No. 104–184) **Page S18559**

Measures Rejected:

Bosnia Deployment: By 22 yeas to 77 nays (Vote No. 601), Senate failed to pass H.R. 2606, to prohibit the use of funds appropriated to the Department of Defense from being used for the deployment on the ground of United States Armed Forces in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina as part of any peacekeeping operation, or as part of any implementation force, unless funds for such deployment are specifically appropriated by law. **Pages S18469–70**

Bosnia Deployment: By 47 yeas to 52 nays (Vote No. 602), Senate failed to agree to S. Con. Res. 35, expressing the opposition of the Congress to President Clinton's planned deployment of United States ground forces to Bosnia.

Pages S18449–S18513, S18515–49, S18551–52

Measures Passed:

Bosnia Deployment: By 69 yeas to 30 nays (Vote No. 603), Senate passed S.J. Res. 44, concerning the deployment of United States Armed Forces in Bosnia and Herzegovina. **Pages S18549–53**

Technical Corrections: Senate agreed to H. Con. Res. 116, directing the Secretary of the Senate to make technical corrections in the enrollment of S. 1060, after agreeing to the following amendment proposed thereto: **Pages S18572–73**

Brown (for Simpson/Gregg) Amendment No. 3098, to add a technical correction. **Pages S18572–73**

Technical Corrections: Senate agreed to S. Con. Res. 36, directing the Secretary of the Senate to make technical corrections in the enrollment of S. 1060. **Page S18573**

Clean Air Act Computer Programs: Senate passed H.R. 325, to amend the Clean Air Act to provide for an optional provision for the reduction of work-related vehicle trips and miles traveled in ozone nonattainment areas designated as severe, clearing the measure for the President.

Pages S18573–75

Roosevelt History Month: Committee on the Judiciary was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 75, to designate October, 1996, as ''Roosevelt History Month'', and the resolution was then agreed to. **Page S18575**

Grades of Offenses: Senate passed S. 1331, to adjust and make uniform the dollar amounts used in title 18 to distinguish between grades of offenses, after agreeing to a committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. **Page S18575**

Panchen Lama of Tibet: Senate passed S.J. Res. 43, expressing the sense of the Congress regarding Wei Jingsheng; Gedhun Choekyi Nyima, the next Panchen Lama of Tibet; and the human rights practices of the Government of the People's Republic of China. **Pages S18575–79**

Au Pair Programs: Senate passed S. 1465, to extend au pair programs, after agreeing to the following amendment proposed thereto: **Pages S18579–80**

Brown (for Helms/Dodd) Amendment No. 3099, to extend au pair programs through fiscal year 1997.

Pages S18579–80

Anticounterfeiting Consumer Protection Act: Senate passed S. 1136, to control and prevent commercial counterfeiting, after agreeing to committee amendments. **Pages S18580–82**

Interior Appropriations Conference Report—Agreement: A unanimous-consent time-agreement

was reached providing for the consideration of the conference report on H.R. 1977, making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, on Thursday, December 14, 1995. **Page S18572**

Messages From the President: Senate received the following messages from the President of the United States:

Transmitting the report of the Farmington Wild and Scenic River Study; referred to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. (PM–103).

Page S18557

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Tom Lantos, of California, to be a Representative of the United States of America to the Fiftieth Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Toby Roth, of Wisconsin, to be a Representative of the United States of America to the Fiftieth Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Gary A. Fenner, of Missouri, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Missouri.

Page S18513

Nominations Withdrawn: Senate received notification of the withdrawal of the following nominations:

Tom Lantos, of California, to be an Alternate Representative of the United States of America to the Fiftieth Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Toby Roth, of Wisconsin, to be an Alternate Representative of the United States of America to the Fiftieth Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations. **Page S18513**

Messages From the President: **Page S18557**

Messages From the House: **Page S18557**

Measures Referred: **Pages S18557–58**

Measures Read First Time: **Page S18579**

Communications: **Page S18558**

Petitions: **Pages S18558–59**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Page S18559**

Statements on Introduced Bills: **Pages S18559–64**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S18564–65**

Amendments Submitted: **Page S18565**

Authority for Committees: **Page S18565**

Additional Statements: **Pages S18565–72**

Record Votes: Three record votes were taken today. (Total–603) **Pages S18470, S18551–52, S18552**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9 a.m., and adjourned at 11:19 p.m., until 9:30 a.m., on Thursday, December 14, 1995. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S18513.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

NOMINATION

Committee on Armed Services: Committee concluded hearings on the nomination of H. Martin Lancaster, of North Carolina, to be Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works, after the nominee, who was introduced by Senator Faircloth, testified and answered questions in his own behalf.

WATER RECLAMATION PROJECTS

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Forests and Public Land Management concluded hearings on S. 901, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to participate in the design, planning, and construction of certain water reclamation and reuse projects and desalination research and development projects, S. 1013, to acquire land for exchange for privately held land for use as wildlife and wetland protection areas in connection with the Garrison Diversion Unit Project, S. 1154, to authorize the construction of the Fort Peck Rural Water Supply System, S. 1169, to authorize construction of facilities for the reclamation and reuse of wastewater at McCall, Idaho, and S. 1186, to provide for the transfer of operation and maintenance of the Flathead Irrigation and Power Project, after receiving testimony from Senators Bennett and Kempthorne; Ada E. Deer, Assistant Secretary of Indian Affairs, and Neil Stessman, Regional Director, Great Plains Region, Bureau of Reclamation, both of the Department of the Interior; Paul Piraino, Alameda County Water District of Fremont, Fremont, California; Bob Gurule, City of Albuquerque Public Works, Albuquerque, New Mexico; Fred W. Finlinson, Callister, Nebeker & McCollough, Salt Lake City, Utah, representing the Central Valley Water Recycling Project; Ron Miller, Fort Peck Rural Water District, Glascow, Montana; Michael Pablo and Daniel Decker, both of the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Nation, Pablo, Montana; Walt Schock, Ross Middlemist and Alan Mikkelsen, all of the Flathead Joint Board of Control, St. Ignatius, Montana; Gary Shimun, McCall, Idaho; David Rockwell, Dixon, Montana; and Jon Metropoulos, Helena, Montana.

AUTHORIZATION—CLEAN WATER ACT

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Committee held oversight hearings on the implementation and proposed authorization of the Clean Water Act, focusing on municipal issues and related measures, S.

1390 and S. 1391, receiving testimony from Senator Pressler; Robert W. Perciasepe, Assistant Administrator for Water, Environmental Protection Agency; Mayor Jeff Wennberg, Rutland, Vermont, on behalf of the National League of Cities; Paul Pinault, Narrangansett Bay Water Quality Management District Commission, Providence, Rhode Island, on behalf of the Association of Metropolitan Sewerage Agencies; Paul Marchetti, Pennsylvania Infrastructure Investment Authority, Harrisburg, on behalf of the Council of Infrastructure Financing Authorities; Jessica C. Landman, Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc., and Al Bilik, AFL–CIO Public Employee Department, both of Washington, D.C.; and Ronald S. Dungan, United Water Resources, Wayne, Pennsylvania, on behalf of the National Association of Water Companies.

Hearings were recessed subject to call.

WHITEWATER

Special Committee to Investigate the Whitewater Development Corporation and Related Matters: Committee resumed hearings to examine certain matters relative to the Whitewater Development Corporation, receiving testimony from Sylvia M. Matthews, Chief of Staff, Department of the Treasury, former Special Assistant to the Assistant to the President for Economic Policy; and Bill Burton, Jones, Day, Reavis and Pogue, Washington, D.C., former Policy and Staff Director for White House Chief of Staff.

Hearings continue tomorrow.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Bills Introduced: 12 public bills, H.R. 2766–2777; and 5 resolutions, H.J. Res. 131, H. Con. Res. 119, and H. Res. 302, 305, 306 were introduced.

Pages H14764–65

Reports Filed: Reports were filed as follows:

H. Res. 301, waiving points of order against the further conference report on H.R. 1977, making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996 (H. Rept. 104–403);

H. Res. 303, providing for the consideration of H.R. 1745, to designate certain public lands in the State of Utah as wilderness (H. Rept. 104–404);

H. Res. 304, providing for debate and for consideration of three measures relating to the deployment of United States Armed Forces in and around the territory of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina (H. Rept. 104–405); and

Conference report on H.R. 1530, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1996 for military activities of the Department of Defense, and to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 1996 (H. Rept. 104–406).

Pages H14377–H14761, H14764, H14796, H14802, H14816

Speaker Pro Tempore: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he designated Representative Taylor of North Carolina to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H14371**

Foreign Operations Appropriations: By a yea-and-nay vote of 226 yeas to 201 nays, Roll No. 850, the House agreed to the Callahan motion that the House recede from its amendment to Senate amendment numbered 115, and agree with an amendment to Senate amendment numbered 115, to H.R. 1868, making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996—clearing the measure for Senate action. **Pages H14787–96**

H. Res. 296, the rule which provided for the motion to dispose of the Senate amendment, was agreed to earlier by a yea-and-nay vote of 241 yeas to 178 nays, Roll No. 849. **Pages H14375–77**

Presidential Message—Farmington River: Read a message from the President wherein he transmits a report for the Farmington River in the States of Massachusetts and Connecticut—referred to the Committee on Resources. **Page H14796**

Three-Day Rule Waiver: By a yea-and-nay vote of 230 yeas to 186 nays, Roll No. 851, the House agreed to H. Res. 297, waiving a requirement of clause 4(b) of rule XI with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules. **Pages H14796–98**

Interior Appropriations: By a yea-and-nay vote of 244 yeas to 181 nays, Roll No. 854, the House agreed to the conference report on H.R. 1977, making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1966. **Pages H14802–16**

By a yea-and-nay vote of 187 yeas to 241 nays, Roll No. 853, the House rejected the Yates motion to recommit the conference report to the committee

of conference with instructions that the House conferees insist on the House position on Senate amendment numbered 108 (relating to use of funds on Tongass National Forest). **Page H14815**

H. Res. 301, the rule which waived points of order against the conference report was agreed to earlier by a yea-and-nay vote of 231 yeas to 188 nays, Roll No. 852. **Pages H14798–H14802**

Deployment of United States Forces to Bosnia: House took the following actions on measures relating to the deployment of United States Armed Forces to Bosnia:

Failed to pass H.R. 2770, to prohibit Federal funds from being used for the deployment on the ground of United States Armed Forces in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina as part of any peacekeeping operation, or as part of any implementation force (failed by a yea-and-nay vote of 210 yeas to 218 nays, Roll No. 856); **Pages H14816–49**

Agreed to H. Res. 302, relating to the deployment of United States Armed Forces in and around the territory of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina to enforce the peace agreement between the parties to the conflict in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina (agreed to by a yea-and-nay vote of 287 yeas to 141 nays with 1 voting ''present'', Roll No. 857); and **Pages H14849–60**

Failed to agree to H. Res. 306, expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the deployment of United States Armed Forces to Bosnia (failed by a yea-and-nay vote of 190 yeas to 237 nays with 1 voting ''present'', Roll No. 858). **Pages H14860–72**

Senate Messages: Messages received from the Senate today appear on page H14872.

Amendments Ordered Printed: Amendments ordered printed pursuant to the rule appear on pages H14765–85.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Ten yea-and-nay votes developed during the proceedings of the House today and appear on pages H14377, H14795–96, H14797–98, H14801–02, H14815, H14815–16, H14824–25, H14848–49, H14860, and H14871–72. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: Met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 12:05 a.m.

Committee Meetings

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Agriculture: Ordered reported amended the following bills: H.R. 2029, Farm Credit System Regulatory Relief Act of 1995; and H.R. 2130, Farmer Mac Reform Act of 1995.

FEDERAL TRUST FUNDS USE

Committee on Banking and Financial Services: Held a hearing on the Treasury Department's use of Federal Trust Funds. Testimony was heard from Representatives Smith of Michigan, Neal of Massachusetts and McIntosh; Robert E. Rubin, Secretary of the Treasury; and a public witness.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities: Subcommittee on Workforce Protections approved for full Committee action the following bills: H.R. 2391, amended, Compensatory Time for All Workers Act of 1995; H.R. 1227, to amend the Portal-to-Portal Act of 1947 relating to the payment of wages to employees who use employer owned vehicles; and H.R. 2531, amended, to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to clarify the exemption for houseparents from the minimum wage and maximum hours requirements of that Act.

MEDICAL SAVINGS ACCOUNT

Committee on Government Reform and Oversight: Subcommittee on Civil Service held a hearing on FEHB/MSA: Adding Medical Savings Accounts-Broadening Employee Options. Testimony was heard from Representatives Salmon and Chrysler; Bret Schundler, Mayor, Jersey City, New Jersey; and public witnesses.

D.C. FISCAL PROTECTION ACT

Committee on Government Reform and Oversight: Subcommittee on the District of Columbia approved for full Committee action amended H.R. 2661, District of Columbia Fiscal Protection Act.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES; COMMITTEE BUSINESS

Committee on House Oversight: Ordered reported the following: H. Con. Res. 106, permitting the use of the rotunda of the Capitol for a ceremony to commemorate the days of remembrance of victims of the Holocaust; H.R. 2739, to provide for a representational allowance for Members of the House of Representatives, to make technical and conforming changes to sundry provisions of law in consequence of administrative reforms in the House of Representatives; a resolution, adopting, a provisional basis, regulations implementing Congressional Accountability Act; and a resolution, adopting, on a provisional basis, regulations implementing Congressional Accountability Act for joint entities.

The Committee also considered other pending Committee business.

ADMINISTRATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION ACT

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Commercial and Administrative Law held on oversight and reauthorization hearing of the Administrative Dispute Resolution Act. Testimony was heard from Peter R. Steenland, Jr., Senior Counsel for Administrative Dispute Resolution, Office of the Associate Attorney General, Department of Justice; Joseph M. McDade, Assistant General Counsel, Office of the General Counsel, Department of the Air Force; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Courts and Intellectual Property approved for full Committee action amended the following bills: H.R. 2511, Anticounterfeiting Consumer Protection Act of 1995 and H.R. 1861, to make technical corrections in the Satellite Home Viewer Act of 1994 and other provisions of title 17, United States Code.

PRIVATE CLAIMS BILLS

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Immigration and Claims met to consider private claims bills.

CHILDREN BORN TO ILLEGAL ALIEN PARENTS

Comittee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Immigration and Claims and the Subcommittee on the constitution held a joint hearing on societal and legal issues surrounding children born in the United States to illegal alien parents. Testimony was heard from Representatives Gallegly, Bilbray, Gutierrez, Beilenson, Stockman, Lofgren, Callahan, and Foley; Walter Dellinger, Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legal Counsel, Department of Justice; former Representative Barbara Jordan of Texas; and public witnesses.

UNITED STATES GROUND FORCES TO BOSNIA

Committee on National Security: Met in executive session to receive a classified briefing on the proposed deployment of United States ground forces to Bosnia. The Committee was briefed by the following officials of the Joint Staff, Department of Defense: Lt. Gen. Howell M. Estes III, USAF, Director of Operations (J–3) and Maj. Gen. Patrick M. Hughes, USA, Director for JCS Support, DIA (J–2).

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Resources: Ordered reported the following bills: H.R. 2726, amended, to make certain technical corrections in laws relating to native Americans; S. 1341, Saddleback Mountain-Arizona Settlement Act of 1995; H.R. 2100, amended, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to make technical corrections to maps relating to the Coastal Barrier Resources System; and H.R. 2738, amended, Central Valley Project Reform Act of 1995.

UTAH PUBLIC LANDS MANAGEMENT ACT

Committee on Rules: Granted, by voice vote, an open rule providing 1 hour of debate on H.R. 1745, Utah Public Lands Management Act of 1995. The rule waives clause 2(l)(6) of rule XI (three-day layover) or section 302(f) (prohibiting consideration of legislation providing new budget authority in excess of a committee's allocation) or section 311(a) (prohibiting consideration of legislation exceeding total Federal spending limits) of the Congressional Budget Act against consideration of the bill. The rule makes in order the Committee on Resources amendment in the nature of a substitute not printed in the bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment. The amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. The rule waives clause 7 of rule XVI (germaneness) and section 302(f) or 311(a) of the Congressional Budget Act against the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The rule provides for the consideration of a manager's amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules, to be offered by the Chairman of the Committee on Resources or his designee, which is considered as read, not subject to amendment or to a division of the question, and is debatable for 10 minutes equally divided between the proponent and an opponent. If adopted, the amendment is considered as part of the base text for further amendment purposes.

The rule authorizes the Chair to accord priority in recognition to members who have preprinted their amendments in the Congressional Record, and the amendments shall be considered as read. Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit, with or without instructions. Testimony was heard from Representatives Hansen, Waldholtz, and Hinchey.

CONFERENCE REPORT—INTERIOR APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Rules: Granted, by voice vote, a rule waiving all points of order against the further conference report to accompany H.R. 1977, making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and against its consideration. The rule provides that the conference report shall be considered as read. Testimony was heard from Representative Regula.

UNITED STATES TROOP DEPLOYMENT IN BOSNIA

Committee on Rules: Granted, by voice vote, a closed rule providing 1 hour of debate in the House on the subject of United States troop deployments in Bosnia, equally divided between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations. The rule provides for consideration in the House of H.R. 2770, with 1 hour of debate divided between Representative Dornan and an opponent, not subject to amendment, and one motion to recommit.

The rule provides for consideration in the House of H. Res. 302, with 1 hour of debate divided between Representative Buyer and an opponent, which is not subject to amendment.

The rule also provides for consideration in the House of a resolution if offered by the Minority Leader or his designee, subject to 1 hour of debate divided between the proponent and an opponent, which is not subject to amendment. Testimony was heard from Chairman Gilman and Representatives Buyer, Rohrabacher, Dornan, Scarborough, Hamilton, Kennedy of Massachusetts, and Skelton.

DIOXIN REASSESSMENT

Committee on Science: Subcommittee on Energy and Environment held a hearing on Scientific Integrity and Federal Policies and Mandates: EPA's Dioxin Reassessment. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the EPA: William Farland, M.D., Director, Office of Health and Environmental Assessment; and Michael Gough, Consultant, Science Advisory Board Panel; George Lucier, M.D., Director, Environment Toxicology Program, National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences, Department of Health and Human Services; Adm. E.R. Zumwalt, USN. (Ret.); and public witnesses.

SOLE-SOURCE CONTRACTING

Committee on Small Business: Held a hearing on a recent GAO report documenting misuse of the program's sole-source contracting authority, management errors, and falsification of eligibility documents. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the SBA: Karen Lee, Deputy Inspector General; and Cal Jenkins, Associate Administrator, Minority Small Business and Capital Ownership Program; Donald Wheeler, Director, Office of Special Investigations, GAO; William Campbell, Chief, Financial Officer, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation; and a public witness.

AVIATION SAFETY

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Aviation held a hearing on Aviation Safety: Should Airlines Be Required to Share Pilot Performance Records? Testimony was heard from Senator McCain; Representative Heineman; David R. Hinson, Administrator, FAA, Department of Transportation; James E. Hall, Chairman, National Transportation Safety Board, and public witnesses.

Hearings continue tomorrow.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Economic Development approved for full Committee action the following bills: H.R. 1718, to designate U.S. Courthouse located at 197 South Main Street in Wilkes-Barre, PA, as the "Max Rosenn United States Courthouse;" H.R. 2504, to designate the Federal building located at the corner of Patton Avenue and Otis Street, and the U.S. Courthouse located on Otis Street, in Asheville, NC, as the 'Veach-Baley Federal Complex;" H.R. 2415, amended, to designate the U.S. Customs administration building at the Ysleta/Zaragosa Port of Entry located at 797 South Ysleta in El Paso, TX, as the "Timothy C. McCaghren Customs Administrative Building;" and H.R. 2620, amended to direct the Architect of the Capitol to sell the parcel of real property located at 501 First Street, SE., in the District of Columbia.

Prior to this action, the Subcommittee held a hearing on these measures, with the exception of H.R. 2620. Testimony was heard from Representative Kanjorski, Coleman, and Poshard.

SHIPBUILDING TRADE AGREEMENT

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Trade approved for full Committee action H.R. 2754, Shipbuilding Trade Agreement Act.

Joint Meetings

APPROPRIATIONS—INTERIOR

Conferees on Tuesday, December 12, agreed to file a further conference report on H.R. 1977, making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996.

ICC TERMINATION ACT

Conferees met to resolve the differences between the Senate- and House-passed versions of H.R. 2539, to abolish the Interstate Commerce Commission, and to amend subtitle IV of title 49, United States Code, to reform economic regulation of transportation, but did not complete action thereon, and recessed subject to call.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, DECEMBER 14, 1995

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, to hold hearings on S. 1271, to amend the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982, 9:30 a.m., SD–366.

Committee on Finance, business meeting, to consider pending calendar business, 10 a.m., SD–215.

Committee on Foreign Relations, to hold hearings to examine the situation in South Africa, 2 p.m., SD–419.

Committee on Governmental Affairs, to hold hearings to examine Federal Government financial management, 9:30 a.m., SD–342.

Committee on the Judiciary, business meeting, to consider pending calendar business, 10 a.m., SD–226.

Committee on Rules and Administration, business meeting, to mark up certain resolutions providing for Smithsonian Regents appointments, S. 426, to authorize the Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity to establish a memorial to Martin Luther King, Jr., in the District of Columbia, H.R. 2527, to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to improve the electoral process by permitting electronic filing and preservation of Federal Election Commission reports, and to consider Senate Internet policy and other pending committee business. , 9:30 a.m., SR–301.

Select Committee on Intelligence, closed briefing on intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SH–219.

Special Committee To Investigate Whitewater Development Corporation and Related Matters, to continue hearings to examine certain issues relative to the Whitewater Development Corporation, 11 a.m., SH–216.

NOTICE

For a Listing of Senate Committee Meetings scheduled ahead, see page E2353 in today's Record.

House

Committee on Agriculture, Subcommittee on Risk Management and Specialty Crops and the Subcommittee on Immigration and Claims of the Committee on the Judiciary, joint hearing on H–2A Temporary Worker Program and its impact on American Agriculture, 9 a.m. 1300 Longworth.

Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, to consider the following: H.R. 1398, to designate the United States Post Office building located at 1203 Lemay Ferry Road, St. Louis, MO, as the ''Charles J. Coyle Post Office Building;'' H.R. 1880, to designate the U.S. Post Office building located at 102 South McLean, Lincoln, IL, as the ''Edward Madigan Post Office Building;'' H.R. 2262, to designate the U.S. Post Office building located at 218 North Alston Street in Foley, AL, as the ''Holk Post Office Building;'' H.R. 2704, to provide that the U.S. Post Office building that is to be located on the 2600 block of East 75th Street in Chicago, IL, shall be known and designated as the ''Charles A. Hayes Post Office Building,'' H.R. 2661, District of Columbia Fiscal Protection Act of 1995; pending draft reports; and a resolution to authorize subpoena in the matter of Harry Thomason, 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Civil Service, hearing on Government Shutdown II, 2 p.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on International Relations, to mark up the following: H. Res. 274, concerning Burma and the U.N. General Assembly; H. Con. Res. 91 expressing the sense of the Congress that the United States should participate in Expo '98 in Lisbon, Portugal; a message to extend the Au Pair Program; and a measure to extend P.L. 480 Authorities; and to hold a hearing on U.S.-Europe: Prospects for Transatlantic Economic Cooperation, 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Crime, oversight hearing on the U.S. Sentencing Commission, 9:30 a.m., 2237 Rayburn.

Committee on National Security, Subcommittee on Military Personnel, hearing on the Department of Defense's comprehensive review of Indochina POW/MIA cases, 10 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Committee on Resources, Subcommittee on Fisheries, Wildlife and Oceans, hearing on the following bills: H.R. 1772, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire certain interests in the Waihee Marsh for inclusion in the Oahu National Wildlife Refuge Complex; H.R. 1836, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire property in the town of East Hampton, Suffolk County, New York, for inclusion in the Amagansett National Wildlife Refuge; H.R. 2660, to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated to the Department of the Interior for the Tensas River National Wildlife Refuge; and H.R. 2679, to revise the boundary of the North Platte National Wildlife Refuge, 10 a.m.. 1334 Longworth.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, to mark up the following bills: H.R. 1718, to designate U.S. Courthouse located at 187 South Main Street in Wilkes-Barre, PA, as the ''Max Rosenn United States Courthouse;'' H.R. 2504, to designate the Federal building located at the corner of Patton Avenue and Otis Street, and the U.S. Courthouse located on Otis Street, in Asheville, NC, as the ''Veach-Baley Federal Complex;'' H.R. 2415, to designate the U.S. Customs administrative building at the Ysleta/Zaragosa Port of Entry located at 797 South Ysleta in El Paso, TX, as the ''Timothy C. McCaghren Customs Administrative Building''; H.R. 2620, to direct the Architect of the Capitol to sell the parcel of real property located at 501 First Street, SE., in the District of Columbia; H.R. 2689, to designate the United States Courthouse located at 301 West Main Street in Benton, IL, as the ''James L. Foreman United States Courthouse''; H.R. 2061, to designate the Federal building located at 1550 Dewey Avenue in Baker City, OR, as the ''David J. Wheeler Federal Building''; H.R. 2111, to designate the Social Security Administration's Western Program Service Center located at 1221 Nevin Avenue in Richmond CA, as the ''Francis J. Hagel Building''; H.R. 2305, to designate the United States Courthouse for the Eastern District of Virginia in Alexandria VA, as the ''Albert V. Bryan United States Courthouse''; H.R. 2481,

to designate the Federal Triangle Project under construction at 14th Street and Pennsylvania Avenue, NW in the District of Columbia, as the ''Ronald Reagan Building and International Trade Center''; H.R. 2547, to designate the United States Courthouse located at 800 Market Street In Knoxville, TN, as the ''Edward H. Baker, Jr. United States Courthouse''; H.R. 2556, to designate the Federal building located at 345 Middlefield Road in Menlo Park, CA and known as the Earth Science and Library Building as the ''Vincent E. McKelvey Federal Building''; S. 369, to designate the United States Courthouse in Decatur, AL, as the ''Seybourn H. Lynne Federal Building''; and H.R. 2567, to amend the Federal Water Pollution Act relating to standards for constructed water conveyance.

Subcommittee on Aviation, to continue hearings on Aviation Safety: Should Airlines Be Required to Share Pilot Performance Records? 9:30 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

9:30 a.m., Thursday, December 14

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: After the recognition of three Senators for speeches and the transaction of any morning business (not to extend beyond 10:30 a.m.), Senate will consider the conference report on H.R. 1977, Interior Appropriations, 1996.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Thursday, December 14

House Chamber

Program for Thursday and Friday: Consideration of H.R. 2621, Concerning Disinvestment of Federal Trust Funds (closed rule, 1 hour of debate); and

H.R. 1745, Utah Public Lands (open rule, 1 hour of general debate).

Congressional Record The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed at one time. ¶Public access to the Congressional Record is available online through *GPO Access,* a service of the Government Printing Office, free of charge to the user. The online database is updated each day the Congressional Record is published. The database includes both text and graphics from the beginning of the 103d Congress, 2d session (January 1994) forward. It is available on the Wide Area Information Server (WAIS) through the Internet and via asynchronous dial-in. Internet users can access the database by using the World Wide Web; the Superintendent of Documents home page address is http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs, by using local WAIS client software or by telnet to swais.access.gpo.gov, then login as guest (no password required). Dial-in users should use communications software and modem to call (202) 512–1661; type swais, then login as guest (no password required). For general information about *GPO Access,* contact the *GPO Access* User Support Team by sending Internet e-mail to help@eids05.eids.gpo.gov, or a fax to (202) 512–1262; or by calling (202) 512–1530 between 7 a.m. and 5 p.m. Eastern time, Monday through Friday, except for Federal holidays. ¶The Congressional Record paper and 24x microfiche will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, at the following prices: paper edition, $112.50 for six months, $225 per year, or purchased for $1.50 per issue, payable in advance; microfiche edition, $118 per year, or purchased for $1.50 per issue payable in advance. The semimonthly Congressional Record Index may be purchased for the same per issue prices. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, directly to the Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily Congressional Record is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the Congressional Record.